

P-CYCLIC PERSISTENT HOMOLOGY AND HOFER DISTANCE

JUN ZHANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we generalize the result from L. Polterovich and E. Shelukhin's paper [PS14] stating that Hofer distance from time-dependent Hamiltonian diffeomorphism to the set of p -th power Hamiltonian diffeomorphism can be arbitrarily large to hold in the product structure $\Sigma_g \times M$ for *any* closed symplectic manifold M when p is sufficiently large and $g \geq 4$. This implies that, on this product, Hofer distance can be arbitrarily large between time-dependent Hamiltonian diffeomorphism and autonomous Hamiltonian diffeomorphism. The basic tool we use is barcode and singular value decomposition that are developed in the paper [UZ15], from which we borrow many proofs and modify them so that it can be adapted to the situation that filtered chain complex equipped with a group action.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Outline of the paper and summary of results.	4
2. Preliminaries on Hamiltonian Floer theory	12
3. Proof of Proposition 1.14	16
4. Proof of Proposition 1.17	17
5. Proof of Theorem 1.18	19
5.1. Reduce to a group action	19
5.2. Preparation	22
5.3. Unperturbed p -cyclic singular value decomposition	30
5.4. Perturbed p -cyclic singular value decomposition	34
5.5. Proof of Theorem 1.18	37
6. Proof of Proposition 1.20	37
7. Lipschitz continuity	37
7.1. Algebraic set-up	38
7.2. Homotopy category	41
7.3. Proofs of Proposition 1.22 and Proposition 1.23	44
8. Computation of egg-beater model Σ_g	45
8.1. Example of computing barcode	46
8.2. Proof of Proposition 1.26	48
9. Computation of product $\Sigma_g \times M$	49
9.1. Product structure of barcode	49
9.2. Proof of Proposition 1.27 and 1.29	52
References	54

Date: May 25, 2016.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Hofer distance between the set of autonomous Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms and a time-dependent Hamiltonian diffeomorphism has been recently studied in [PS14]. We first give several definitions.

Recall that given any closed symplectic manifold (X, ω) , any (smooth) function $H : [0, 1] \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ will generate a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $\phi = \phi_H^1$ which is time-1 map of flow $\{\phi_H^t\}$. Denote by $Ham(X, \omega)$ the set of all the Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms. Not only can we prove $Ham(X, \omega)$ is a group, but also we can associate a bi-invariant metric on this group which is the well-known as Hofer's metric, denoted as d_H . Hofer's metric is defined by the following two steps. First, for any $\phi \in Ham(X, \omega)$, define (Hofer's norm)

$$\|\phi\|_H = \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 \left(\max_X H(t, \cdot) - \min_X H(t, \cdot) \right) dt \mid \phi = \phi_H^1 \right\}.$$

Then define Hofer's metric by, for $\phi, \psi \in Ham(X, \omega)$,

$$(1) \quad d_H(\phi, \psi) = \|\phi^{-1} \circ \psi\|_H.$$

Definition 1.1. For a closed symplectic manifold (X, ω) , define

$$\text{Aut}(X) = \{\phi \in Ham(X, \omega) \mid \phi = \phi_H^1 \text{ where } H(t, x) \text{ is independent of } t\}.$$

Definition 1.2. Let $k \geq 2$. For a symplectic manifold X , define

$$\text{aut}(X) = \sup_{\phi \in Ham(X, \omega)} d_H(\phi, \text{Aut}(X)),$$

where d_H is Hofer's metric defined by (1).

A special feature of time independent (or usually called autonomous) Hamiltonian diffeomorphism compared with time-dependent Hamiltonian comes from the following easy observation. If a time-dependent function $F(t, x)$, as a Hamiltonian, generates ψ , then

$$(2) \quad H(t, x) = pF(pt, x) \text{ generates } \phi = \psi^p.$$

If, in particular, $\phi \in \text{Aut}(X)$, then for any prime p , we can simply take generating function $F(x) = \frac{1}{p}H(x)$ which generates a p -th root of ϕ . This motivates another more delicate definition as follows.

Definition 1.3. Let prime $p \geq 2$. For a symplectic manifold X , define

$$\text{Power}_p(X) = \{\phi = \psi^p \mid \psi \in Ham(X)\}.$$

Definition 1.4. Let prime $p \geq 2$. For a symplectic manifold X , define

$$\text{power}_p(X) = \sup_{\phi \in Ham(X)} d_H(\phi, \text{Power}_p(X))$$

where d_H is Hofer's metric defined by (1).¹

¹The original definition in [PS14] is defined for any integer $k \geq 2$. But since

$$d_H(\phi, \text{Power}_p(X)) \leq d_H(\phi, \text{Power}_k(X)) \text{ when } p \mid k,$$

As we have noticed earlier, $\text{Aut}(X) \subset \bigcap_{p \text{ is prime}} \text{Power}_p(X)$. With the notations above, we can state the following main theorem in [PS14],

Theorem 1.5. *[Theorem 1.3 in [PS14]] Let Σ_g be a fixed closed oriented surface with genus $g \geq 4$. For any symplectically aspherical closed manifold M is and for any $p \geq 2$. We have*

$$\text{power}_p(\Sigma_g \times M) = +\infty.$$

Note that Theorem 1.5 (taking the limit along all the prime number p) immediately implies, under the same hypothesis of Theorem 1.5,

$$\text{aut}(\Sigma_g \times M) = +\infty.$$

This is actually another theorem stated in [PS14] (Theorem 1.2), where its original proof comes from different (easier) process than the original proof of Theorem 1.5. Last but not least, we emphasize that results mentioned above are within the effort to prove or understand the following general conjecture

Conjecture 1.6. *For any closed symplectic manifold X , $\text{aut}(X) = +\infty$.*

Now back to Theorem 1.5, from the title of [PS14], its proof involves persistence module theory or persistence homology (see [CZ05] for “basic version” of persistence module theory. However, the persistence module theory from [CZ05] can only be used in Hamiltonian Floer theory when the symplectic manifold is monotone). For any given prime p , define an operator R_p on the component of the loop space $\mathcal{L}_\alpha X$ consisting of all loops representing some homotopy class α by rotation

$$R_p(x(t)) = x\left(t + \frac{1}{p}\right).$$

Given a time-dependent Hamiltonian function $H(t, x)$ generating ϕ , denote $H^{(p)}(t, x) = pH(pt, x)$ generating ϕ^p by (2). Notice if $x(t)$ is a Hamiltonian 1-periodic orbit of Hamiltonian $H^{(p)}$, then $R_p(x(t))$ is also a Hamiltonian 1-periodic orbit from $H^{(p)}$ because $p(t + 1/p) = pt + 1 = pt$ on $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. This induces a filtered chain isomorphism between two Floer chain complexes for each degree $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$(3) \quad R_p : CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \rightarrow CF_k(H^{(p)}, (R_p)_* J_t)_\alpha = CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p}})_\alpha.$$

After passing to the homology, taking advantage of the fact that Floer homology is independent of almost complex structure, we get a pair

$$(4) \quad (\mathbb{H}_k(\phi), T)$$

where

- $\mathbb{H}_k(\phi) = (\{HF_k^{(-\infty, s)}(\phi^p)_\alpha\}_{s \in \mathbb{R}}; \phi_{s,t})$ is a persistence module (see Definition 3.1 in [CZ05]), where transition function $\phi_{s,t}$ is induced by inclusion for any $s < t$;
- $[(R_p)_*] = T$ is a filtered isomorphism (or 0-interleaving) giving a $\mathbb{Z}_p$ action on $\mathbb{H}_k(\phi)$, that is, $T^p = \mathbb{I}$.

we will only consider prime number p here.

In order to successfully link Floer theory and persistence module theory, a numerical measurement $\mu_p(\phi)$ is defined (on the top of page 40 in [PS14]) by using combinatorics data (barcode) from the associated persistence module (4) satisfying Lipschitz continuity with respect to Hofer's metric. Therefore, by *the* most important theorem in this theory — *isometry theorem*, this proposition translates combinatorics information from barcode to analysis information between (Floer) chain complexes which is captured partially by Hofer metric. This turns out to be the key step in the proof of Theorem 1.5.

To generalize this process, we will make efforts in two directions. First, we will use more sophisticated and powerful persistence module theory that is developed in the paper [UZ15] to rewrite the set-up of this problem in the (Floer) chain complex level. Second, following the idea above, we will also define some numerical measurement (in fact proved to be a symplectic invariant) which satisfies Lipschitz continuity with respect to Hofer's metric. We point out no effort will be made in this paper improving the product structure as in the result of Theorem 1.5.

Remark 1.7. Through out the paper [PS14], the working field $\mathcal{K}$, should satisfies the following important restriction. As we will also assume this condition in this paper, we state it separately here. **Irreducible condition:**

- $\text{char}(\mathcal{K}) \neq p$ and $\mathcal{K}$ contains all p -th roots of unity;
- For any primitive p -th root of unity ξ_p , there is no solution of the following equation $x^p = \xi_p^q$ unless $p \mid q$.

Note that this condition gives a strong restriction on the dimension of invariant subspace. Specifically, if V is a $\mathcal{T}$ -invariant subspace such that $\mathcal{T}^p = \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}$ for some p -th root of unity ξ_p , then $p \mid \dim(V)$. (cf. Lemma 4.15 in [PS14]).

Here is our main theorem in this paper.

Theorem 1.8. *Let Σ_g be a fixed closed oriented surface with genus $g \geq 4$. For any closed symplectic manifold M and for any prime $p > \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2n} b_i(M)$,*

$$\text{power}_p(\Sigma_g \times M) = +\infty.$$

This immediately implies

Theorem 1.9. *Let Σ_g be a fixed closed oriented surface with genus $g \geq 4$. For any closed symplectic manifold M ,*

$$\text{aut}(\Sigma_g \times M) = +\infty.$$

So we are closer to the Conjecture 1.6 compared with results in [PS14].

1.1. Outline of the paper and summary of results. Before starting to outline the proof of Theorem 1.8, we will recall some definitions from [UZ15] describing a general framework that Floer theory can fit into, which will be helpful to state our main propositions. First, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $CF_k(M, H)$ is a finite dimensional vector space over Novikov field $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ equipped with a filtration function denoted as ℓ defined by action functional. In general, for such filtered vector space denoted as (V, ℓ) , we can find an

ordered basis $(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ such that it satisfies *orthogonality property* (see Definition 2.7 in [UZ15]), that is, for any $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{X}, \Gamma}$,

$$\ell \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i x_i \right) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \ell(\lambda_i x_i).$$

We call such basis an *orthogonal basis of (V, ℓ)* . If, in particular, $\ell(x_i) = 0$ for all i , then it is called an *orthonormal basis*. (V, ℓ) is then called an *orthogonalizable $\Lambda^{\mathcal{X}, \Gamma}$ -space*. Theorem 3.4 in [UZ15] guarantees, for linear map $T : (V, \ell_1) \rightarrow (W, \ell_2)$, there exists a nice choice of orthogonal bases for (V, ℓ_1) and (W, ℓ_2) which are compatible with A in the following sense.

Definition 1.10. For a nonzero $\Lambda^{\mathcal{X}, \Gamma}$ -linear map $T : (V, \ell_1) \rightarrow (W, \ell_2)$ with rank r , we say that (ordered) orthogonal bases $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$ for V and $(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ for W form a *singular value decomposition of T* if

- $\ker(T) = \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{X}, \Gamma}} \langle y_{r+1}, \dots, y_n \rangle$;
- $\text{Im}(T) = \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{X}, \Gamma}} \langle x_1, \dots, x_r \rangle$;
- $T(y_i) = x_i$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$;
- $\ell_1(y_1) - \ell_2(x_1) \geq \dots \geq \ell_1(y_r) - \ell_2(x_r)$.

Then given filtered chain complex (C_*, ∂_*, ℓ) and any degree k , when restricting to

$$C_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}} \ker(\partial_k),$$

we will get a singular value decomposition of ∂_{k+1} denoted as $((y_1, \dots, y_n), (x_1, \dots, x_m))$. We define our barcode (see Definition 6.3 in [UZ15]) as follows.

Definition 1.11. Degree- k verbose barcode of (C_*, ∂_*, ℓ) consists of multiset of elements of $(\mathbb{R}/\Gamma) \times [0, \infty]$ in the form

- (1) $(\ell(x_i) \bmod \Gamma, \ell(y_i) - \ell(x_i))$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$;
- (2) $(\ell(x_i) \bmod \Gamma, \infty)$ for $i \in \{r+1, \dots, m\}$.

where $((y_1, \dots, y_n), (x_1, \dots, x_m))$ is a singular value decomposition of ∂_{k+1} . Moreover, define *degree- k concise barcode* to be the submultiset of the verbose barcode consisting of those whose second element is positive.

One quantitative measurement between $(C_*, \partial_*, \ell_C)$ and $(D_*, \partial_*, \ell_D)$ arising from the standard analysis in Floer theory is *quasiequivalence distance* (see Definition 1.3 in [UZ15]). Here we give a slightly more general definition.

Definition 1.12. Let $(C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C)$ and $(D_*, \partial_D, \ell_D)$ be two filtered chain complexes, and $\delta_+, \delta_- \geq 0$. A (δ_+, δ_-) -quasiequivalence between C_* and D_* is a quadruple (Φ, Ψ, K_1, K_2) where:

- $\Phi : C_* \rightarrow D_*$ and $\Psi : D_* \rightarrow C_*$ are chain maps, with $\ell_D(\Phi c) \leq \ell_C(c) + \delta_+$ and $\ell_C(\Psi d) \leq \ell_D(d) + \delta_-$ for all $c \in C_*$ and $d \in D_*$.
- $K_C : C_* \rightarrow C_{*+1}$ and $K_D : D_* \rightarrow D_{*+1}$ obey the homotopy equations $\Psi \circ \Phi - I_{C_*} = \partial_C K_C + K_C \partial_C$ and $\Phi \circ \Psi - I_{D_*} = \partial_D K_D + K_D \partial_D$, and for all $c \in C_*$ and $d \in D_*$ we have $\ell_C(K_C c) \leq \ell_C(c) + \delta_+ + \delta_-$ and $\ell_D(K_D d) \leq \ell_D(d) + \delta_+ + \delta_-$.

The quasiequivalence distance between $(C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C)$ and $(D_*, \partial_D, \ell_D)$ is then defined to be

$$d_Q(C_*, D_*) = \inf \left\{ \frac{\delta_+ + \delta_-}{2} \geq 0 \mid \begin{array}{c} \text{There exists a } (\delta_+, \delta_-)\text{-quasiequivalence between} \\ (C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C) \text{ and } (D_*, \partial_D, \ell_D) \end{array} \right\}.$$

An algebraic structure that has been effectively used in [UZ15] and also frequently used in this paper is filtered mapping cone (see Definition 9.17 in [UZ15]). Here we give its construction in the following special case.

Definition 1.13. Given any (C_*, ∂_*, ℓ) and a filtration preserving map $\mathcal{T}$ on it, we call the following chain complex *self-mapping cone*

$$\text{Cone}_C(\mathcal{T})_* := C_* \oplus C_{*-1} \quad \text{with} \quad \partial_{co} := \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -\mathcal{T} \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix}.$$


Moreover, define its filtration ℓ_{co} by, for any $(x_1, x_2) \in \text{Cone}_C(\mathcal{T})_*$,

$$\ell_{co}((x_1, x_2)) = \max\{\ell(x_1), \ell(x_2)\}.$$

Now we summarize the outline.

1.1.1. Construction of obstruction. First, we give the recipe in this story to construct a numerical measurement (proved to be symplectic invariant) using both Floer theory and Floer-Novikov persistent homology theory developed in [UZ15].

(5)



We will explain each of the boxes and then followed by explanation of each of the arrows above by emphasizing the speciality when $\phi = \phi_H \in \text{Power}_p(X)$ because eventually we will use the numerical measurement constructed above to form an obstruction to the condition that $\phi \in \text{Power}_p(X)$.

Floer chain complex. Rotation action (3) on the Floer chain complex can pushforward the almost complex structure, so once we are working on the Floer chain complex, the rotation action (3) does not behave as well as on the Floer homology in the sense that in order to work on the same chain complex, we need to use some continuation map C ,

$$(6) \quad CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \xrightarrow{R_p} CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p}})_\alpha \xrightarrow{C} CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha.$$

$T = C \circ R_p$

Note that in general, $T^p \neq \mathbb{I}$, which is the source of most of the difficulty when we are working on the chain complex level. Meanwhile, recall in the proof of Theorem 4.22

in [PS14], if $\phi \in \text{Power}_p(X)$, say $\phi = \psi^p$ for some $\psi \in \text{Ham}(X, \omega)$, then there exists a well-defined chain map for each degree $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$R_{p^2} : CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \rightarrow CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p^2}})_\alpha$$

where $H(t, x) = pF(pt, x)$ and F is a Hamiltonian generating ψ . Again, in order to work on a single space itself, we need to use some continuation map C' to form the following composition

$$(7) \quad CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \xrightarrow{R_{p^2}} CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p^2}})_\alpha \xrightarrow{C'} CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha.$$

$S = C' \circ R_{p^2}$

Our first observation is

Proposition 1.14. *For any closed symplectic manifold (X, ω) , if $\phi = \phi_H \in \text{Power}_p(X)$, then for any degree $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a continuation map $C : CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p^2}})_\alpha \rightarrow CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha$ and a continuation map $C' : CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p^2}})_\alpha \rightarrow CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha$ such that, $T = S^p$, where T and S are compositions in (6) and (7).*

This result is proved in Section 3. It is an analogous relation compared with relation $[(R_p)_*] = [(R_{p^2})_*]^p$ on $HF_k(\phi^p)$.

Notation 1.15. For the rest of the paper, whenever we use T , it always means the composition defined in (6). If we need to emphasize the Hamiltonian H of the corresponding system, we will denote it as T^H . Whenever we use T_p , it always means the resulting composition from Proposition 1.14 that has p -th root.

Self-mapping cone. Define mapping cone of chain complex $CF_*(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha$ with respect to map $T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}$. We call it a *self-mapping cone* of $(CF_*(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha, \partial)$. Degree- k piece is

$$(8) \quad (\text{Cone}_{CF(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}))_k = CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \oplus CF_{k-1}(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha$$

and the boundary map ∂_{co} is

$$(9) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix}$$

where ∂ is Floer boundary operator of $CF_*(H^{(p)}, J_t)$. Moreover,

Definition 1.16. For any element $(x_1, x_2) \in (\text{Cone}_{CF(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}))_*$, if $CF_*(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha$ is acted by some map A , then define its *double map* $\mathcal{D}_A$ by

$$\mathcal{D}_A(x_1, x_2) = (Ax_1, Ax_2).$$

In particular, by (6) and (7), self-mapping cone is acted by double maps

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{D}_T = \mathcal{D}_{R_p} + C_T,$$

for some map C_T who strictly lowers the filtration, and (if it exists) also

$$(11) \quad \mathcal{D}_S = \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}} + C_S,$$

for some map C_S who also strictly lowers the filtration. Moreover, by Proposition 1.14, $\mathcal{D}_S^p = \mathcal{D}_T$. The following proposition shows our self-mapping cone is well-defined.

Proposition 1.17. *For any closed symplectic manifold (X, ω) , up to a filtered isomorphism, construction of $(\text{Cone}_{CF(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}))_*, \partial_{co})$ is independent of choice of continuation map (to form map T). Moreover, $\mathcal{D}_T$ and $\mathcal{D}_S$ defined in (10) and (11) are chain maps on $(\text{Cone}_{CF(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}))_*, \partial_{co})$, i.e., commute with boundary operator of mapping cone ∂_{co} .*

Barcode of self-mapping cone. By definition of barcode, we know these combinatorics data can reveal algebraic structures of the chain complex. For barcode of self-mapping cone defined above, a natural question is whether this “special” action $\mathcal{D}_S$ (if it exists) will shape its barcode in some way. In fact, we have the following important theorem.

Theorem 1.18. *If $\phi = \phi_{H_\lambda}^1 \in \text{Power}_p(X)$, then for any degree $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and boundary map $(\partial_{co})_{k+1} : (\text{Cone}_{CF(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}))_{k+1} \rightarrow \text{Im}(\partial_{co})_{k+1}$ ², each bar in the concise barcode of $(\partial_{co})_{k+1}$ (that is, degree- k concise barcode) has its multiplicity divisible by p .*

This proposition is an analogue (but stronger) result with Proposition 4.18 in [PS14]. The proof of this theorem is the most time-consuming part of this paper. The section 5 is devoted to its proof. But it should be easy to believe in that $\mathcal{D}_S$ is a strictly lower filtration perturbation of a group action $\mathcal{D}_{R, p^2}$ with order p^2 , which makes each degree- k piece $(\text{Cone}_{CF(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}))_k$ a representation. This restricts the singular value decomposition (see Definition 1.10) in a certain special form.

Numerical measurement. Based on Theorem 1.18, we can define some numerical measurement from this combinatorics data.

Definition 1.19. First take the collection of length of bar in degree- k concise barcode of self-mapping cone constructed with respect to $\phi = \phi_H$, denoted as $\{\beta_i\}$ and by definition,

$$\beta_1(\phi) \geq \beta_2(\phi) \dots \geq \beta_{m_k}(\phi) > 0$$

(so m_k = multiplicity of degree- k concise barcode). Then *degree- k divisibility sensitive invariant* of $\phi = \phi_H$ is defined as

$$\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)_k = \max_{s \in \mathbb{N}} (\beta_{sp+1}(\phi) - \beta_{(s+1)p}(\phi))$$

and if $(s+1)p > m_k$, set $\beta_{(s+1)p}(\phi) = 0$. In general, *divisibility sensitive invariant* of $\phi = \phi_H$ is defined as

$$\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi) = \max_{\text{primitive } \xi_p} \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)_k.$$

Likewise multiplicity sensitive spread $\mu(\phi)$ in [PS14], $\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)$ is used to provide an obstruction to the condition $\phi \in \text{Power}_p(X)$. Specifically, we have the proposition,

²In general, to compute (degree- k) barcode of $(\partial_{co})_{k+1}$, we need codomain to be $\ker(\partial_{co})_k$. But in this paper, we only consider Hamiltonian Floer chain complex of non-contractible loop, so it can be shown that homology of mapping cone vanishes. Therefore, $\ker(\partial_{co})_k = \text{Im}(\partial_{co})_{k+1}$.

Proposition 1.20. *If $\phi \in \text{Power}_p(X)$, $\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi) = 0$ and if $p \nmid m_k$ for some degree k , then $\phi_X(\phi) \geq \beta_{m_k}(\phi)$.*

This proposition is proved in Section 6.

Now we move to the arrows in the diagram (5). All (a), (b) and (c) are in the flavor of Lipschitz continuity. From now on, we will simply denote

$$\text{Cone}(H)_* := ((\text{Cone}_{CF(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha}(T^H - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}))_*, \partial_{co, H}),$$

and

$$\text{Cone}(G)_* := ((\text{Cone}_{CF(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha}(T^G - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}))_*, \partial_{co, G}),$$

the mapping cones constructed from different Hamiltonian functions H and G . First, (a) is corresponding to the following proposition,

Proposition 1.21. *For any Hamiltonian H and G , we have*

$$d_Q(\text{Cone}(H)_*, \text{Cone}(G)_*) \leq 3p \cdot \|H - G\|_H.$$

Moreover, (b) is corresponding to the following proposition which will be a direct application of Corollary 8.8 in [UZ15].

Proposition 1.22. *Denote $\beta_i(\phi_H)$ as the length of i -th bar in degree- k verbose barcode of $\text{Cone}(H)_*$ and $\beta_i(\phi_G)$ as the length of i -th bar in degree- k verbose barcode of $\text{Cone}(G)_*$. We have*

$$|\beta_i(\phi_H) - \beta_i(\phi_G)| \leq 4d_Q(\text{Cone}(H)_*, \text{Cone}(G)_*)$$

for every $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Note that (a) and (b) together easily imply the following proposition which (c) is corresponding to,

Proposition 1.23. *For any closed symplectic manifold (X, ω) and $\phi, \psi \in \text{Ham}(X, \omega)$, we have*

$$|\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi) - \mathfrak{o}_X(\psi)| \leq 24p \cdot d_H(\phi, \psi).$$

All three of these Lipschitz style propositions are proved in Section 7.

Remark 1.24. Indeed, $\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)$ defined here and $\mu(\phi)$ defined in [PS14] are similar but not completely related. On the one hand, we point out that $\mu(\phi)$ can also be defined in the Floer-Novikov persistent homology theory language developed in [UZ15] in the chain complex level. Unfortunately, (weak) stabilization proposition - Theorem 4.23 in [PS14] (with *corrected version*) can be modified to hold for general symplectic manifold M , but it can not be applied in the same way as in [PS14], especially when $c_1(M)$ is not zero. On the other hand, in some special cases (for instance, Γ is dense), interested reader can verify there exist positive constants C_1 and C_2 both depending on p such that $C_1\mu(\phi) \leq \mathfrak{o}_X(\phi) \leq C_2\mu(\phi)$.

Finally, (d) combines all the results together giving the following intermediate theorem that reflects the main part of argument of the proof of our main theorem.

Theorem 1.25. *For any closed symplectic manifold (X, ω) , suppose there exists a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $\phi = \phi_H$ such that for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p \nmid m_k$ where m_k is the multiplicity of degree- k concise barcode of $\text{Cone}(H)_*$. Then we have*

$$\text{power}_p(X) \geq \frac{1}{24p} \beta_{m_k}(\phi_H).$$

Proof. For any given $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{power}_p(X) + \epsilon &= \sup_{\phi \in \text{Ham}(X, \omega)} d_H(\phi, \text{Power}_p(X)) + \epsilon \\ &\geq d_H(\phi_H, \text{Power}_p(X)) + \epsilon && \text{by Definition 1.4} \\ &\geq d_H(\phi_H, \psi) && \text{for some } \psi \in \text{Power}_p(X) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{24p} |\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi_H) - \mathfrak{o}_X(\psi)| && \text{by Proposition 1.22} \\ &= \frac{1}{24p} \mathfrak{o}_X(\phi_H) && \text{by Proposition 1.20} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{24p} \beta_{m_k}(\phi_H). && \text{by Proposition 1.20} \end{aligned}$$

Since ϵ is arbitrarily chosen, we get the conclusion. $\square$

1.1.2. Egg-beater model and product structure. From the argument above, we notice that in order to prove Conjecture 1.6, for any given symplectic manifold X , we should be able to handle the following two issues:

- (i) find a family of $\phi_\lambda = \phi_{H_\lambda}^1 \in \text{Ham}(X, \omega)$ such that $\beta_{m_k}(\phi_\lambda) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$;
- (ii) control the non-divisibility of multiplicity of concise barcode $\text{Cone}(H_\lambda)_*$ by p ;

In general, this might be difficult, especially for condition (i). Our main theorem indicates we can do these on $X = \Sigma_g \times M$ for any closed symplectic manifold, which is the key to succeed in generating results from [PS14]. Here since we take advantage of a chaotic model called “egg-beater model” which has been carefully studied in [PS14] (see Section 5.4), a brief introduction of this is needed.

Egg-beater model. Egg-beater model (Σ_g, ϕ_λ) with $g \geq 4$ is constructed to create large action gap. On Σ_g , we will focus on a pair of annuli intersecting each other in a way such that in each component separated by the annuli there exists some genus (see Figure 2 in [PS14]). Moreover, our Hamiltonian dynamics comes from a family of shear flow ϕ_λ^t (highly degenerated) generated by a family of special Hamiltonian functions supported only on the union of these annuli (see Figure 3 in [PS14]). The upshot is that we have a well-defined Floer chain complex (for non-contractible loop), denoted as

$$(12) \quad CF_*(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha$$

where α represents a homotopy class of a non-contractible loop and ϕ_λ is a family of Hamiltonian diffeomorphism parametrized by sufficiently large λ (with family of

generating Hamiltonians denoted as H_λ). The generator of this chain complex is non-contractible Hamiltonian orbits which can be identified with fixed point and interestingly, by the construction of ϕ_λ^p , there are exactly 2^{2p} -many generators coming in p -tuple in the sense that if z is a non-degenerate fixed point, then each one from the following cyclic permutation

$$(13) \quad \{z, \phi_\lambda z, \dots, \phi_\lambda^{p-1} z\}$$

is also a non-degenerate fixed point. Moreover, actions and indices on $\phi_\lambda^j z$ are the same for all $j \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$. Rotation action R_p acts on generators as $R_p(\phi_\lambda^j z) = \phi_\lambda^{j+1 \bmod p} z$.

This model itself provides an example that we can carry on computation concerning (i) and (ii) mentioned above. On the one hand, Proposition 5.1 in [PS14] confirms the asymptotic (to infinity) behavior of action gap required in (i). On the other hand, we have the following proposition, proved in Section 8, handling the other issue on multiplicity in (ii),

Proposition 1.26. *For any given prime number p , total multiplicity of concise barcode of self-mapping cone for $CF_*(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha$ is 2^{2p} . In particular, there exists some degree k such that $p \nmid m_k$ where m_k is the multiplicity of degree- k concise barcodes.*

Product structure. First, for the following product of Floer chain complexes,

$$CF_*(\Sigma_g \times M, \phi_\lambda^p \times \mathbb{I})_{\alpha \times \{pt\}} = CF_*(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha \otimes CF_*(M, \mathbb{I})_{\{pt\}}$$

by the recipe (5) above, we will consider degree-1 concise barcode of self-mapping cone of $CF_*(\Sigma_g \times M, \phi_\lambda^p \times \mathbb{I})_{\alpha \times \{pt\}}$, denoted as

$$(14) \quad Cone_\otimes(H_\lambda)_*.$$

By careful study of barcode under product structure, we can prove, in Section 9,

Proposition 1.27. *For any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, length of i -th bar in degree-1 concise barcode of $Cone_\otimes(H_\lambda)_*$ satisfies*

$$\beta_i(\phi_\lambda^p \times \mathbb{I}) \rightarrow \infty \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty$$

for any $i \leq m_1$ where m_1 is the multiplicity of degree-1 concise barcode.

Finally, by referring to CZ-index formula of generator of egg-beater model (see Theorem 5.2 in [AKKKPRRSSZ16]) and the following definition,

Definition 1.28. Define k -th quantum Betti number of M $qb_k(M)$ by

$$qb_k(M) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} b_{k+2Ns}(M)$$

where $b_{k+2Ns}(M)$ is the classical $(k+2Ns)$ -th Betti number of M and N is minimal Chern number of M . Note when N is sufficiently large, for instance, $c_1(TM) = 0$, $qb_k(M) = b_k(M)$.

we can show, also in Section 9,

Proposition 1.29. Denote m_1 as multiplicity of degree-1 concise barcode of $\text{Cone}_\otimes(H_\lambda)_*$. If

$$(15) \quad p \nmid (qb_p(M) + 2qb_0(M) + qb_{-p}(M))$$

then $p \nmid m_1$. In particular, if $p > \sum_{i=0}^{\dim(M)} b_i(M)$, then (15) is always satisfied.

Note that non-divisibility condition in Proposition 1.29 can sometimes be improved. See Remark 9.4.

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to my advisor, Michael Usher, for various useful conversations and suggestions. I am also grateful to L. Polterovich and D. Rosen for useful conversations. Some of these conversations occurred during my visit to ICERM in Summer 2015. Moreover, my understanding of egg-beater model profited from Computational Symplectic Topology Workshop that is organized by R. Hind, Y. Ostrover, L. Polterovich and M. Usher, which is hosted by Tel Aviv University and ICREM. I thank for their hospitality.

2. PRELIMINARIES ON HAMILTONIAN FLOER THEORY

Hamiltonian Floer theory associates a filtered chain complex to any “non-degenerate” Hamiltonian $H : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on a compact symplectic manifold (X, ω) . We will briefly review some of its key ingredients for our purpose in this section. These ingredients have been progressively generalized along the way from [Fl89], [Sal90], [HS95], [FO99], [Pa13].

Suppose (X, ω) is a close connected symplectic manifold. Given any smooth Hamiltonian function $H : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, it induces a time-dependent Hamiltonian vector field X_H by taking advantage of non-degeneracy of ω , i.e.,

$$\omega(\cdot, X_H) = d(H(t, \cdot)).$$

This vector field X_H induces a flow denoted as ϕ_H^t . Fixed point of time-1 map ϕ_H^1 is corresponding to a loop $\gamma : \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow X$ such that $\gamma(t) = \phi_H^t(\gamma(0))$. We say that H is *non-degenerate* if for each such loop γ ,

$$(d\phi_H^1)_{\gamma(0)} : T_{\gamma(0)}X \rightarrow T_{\gamma(0)}X$$

has all eigenvalues distinct from 1. In terms of constructing Floer chain complex, we will not use all the loops. There are two different versions. One is to use all the contractible loops. Denote the collection of all such loops by $\mathcal{L}(X)$ (or $\mathcal{L}_{\{pt\}}(X)$ if necessary). The other is to use non-contractible loops in a fixed homotopy class $\alpha \in \pi_1(M)$. Denote the collection of all such loops by $\mathcal{L}_\alpha(X)$.

We will start from the construction of the first one. View γ as a boundary of a embedded disk D^2 in X , i.e., there is a map $u : D^2 \rightarrow M$ and $u|_{\partial D^2} = \gamma$. Now we consider a covering space of $\mathcal{L}(X)$, denoted as $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}(X)}$ constructed by

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}(X)} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{equivalent class } [\gamma, u] \\ \text{of pair } (\gamma, u) \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} (\gamma, u) \text{ is equivalent to } (\tau, v) \iff \\ \gamma(t) = \tau(t) \text{ and } [u\#(-v)] \in \ker([\omega]) \cap \ker(c_1) \end{array} \right. \right\},$$

For each $[\gamma, u] \in \widetilde{\mathcal{L}(X)}$, there are two functions associated to it. One is *action functional* $\mathcal{A}_H : \mathcal{L}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_H([\gamma, u]) = - \int_{D^2} u^* \omega + \int_0^1 H(t, \gamma(t)) dt.$$

The other one is Conley-Zehnder index $\mu_{CZ} : \widetilde{\mathcal{L}(X)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ defined by, roughly speaking, counting rotation of $d\phi_H^t$ on along $\gamma(t)$ with the help of trivialization induced by u . Its explicit definition can be referred to [RS93]. Because of the conditions in $\mathcal{L}(X)$ above, action functional and Conley-Zehnder index of $[\gamma, u]$ are both well-defined. As a vector space over ground field $\mathcal{K}$, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, degree- k part of Floer chain complex $CF_k(H, J)$ (or $CF_k(H, J)_{\{pt\}}$ if necessary) is defined as

$$\left\{ \sum_{\substack{[\gamma, u] \in \widetilde{\mathcal{L}(X)}, \\ \mu_{CZ}([\gamma, u]) = k}} a_{[\gamma, u]} [\gamma, u] \mid a_{[\gamma, u]} \in \mathcal{K}, (\forall C \in \mathbb{R})(\#\{[\gamma, u] \mid a_{[\gamma, u]} \neq 0, \mathcal{A}_H([\gamma, u]) > C\} < \infty) \right\}.$$

Now denote

$$s_0 = \{w : S^2 \rightarrow X \mid \langle c_1(TX), w_*[S^2] \rangle = 0\}.$$

Note that if we change $[\gamma, u]$ by gluing some sphere $w \in s_0$ on the capping u , it will change the action functional by $-\int_{S^2} w^* \omega$, possibly not zero, but keep the degree the same. More importantly, if such action difference is non-zero, then $[\gamma, u] \neq [\gamma, u \# w]$ in $CF_k(H, J)$, which implies that as a vector space over $\mathcal{K}$, $CF_k(H, J)$ is in general infinitely dimensional. It is finite dimensional if ω vanishes on the image of Hurewicz map $i : \pi_2(X) \rightarrow H_2(X, \mathbb{Z})/\text{Torsion}$, in which case X is usually called *weakly exact* (a stronger condition called *symplectic aspherical* if both ω and c_1 vanishes).

In order to overcome this dimension issue, [HS95] suggests to consider a bigger coefficient field - Novikov field $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ defined as

$$\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma} = \left\{ \sum_{g \in \Gamma} a_g t^g \mid a_g \in \mathcal{K}, (\forall C \in \mathbb{R})(\#\{g \mid a_g \neq 0, g < C\} < \infty) \right\}$$

where $\Gamma = \left\{ \int_{S^2} w^* \omega \mid w \in s_0 \right\} \leq \mathbb{R}$ and t is a formal variable. It is then easy to check that $CF_k(H, J)$ is now a finite dimensional vector space over $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ and its dimension is equal to the number of $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}(X)$ such that there is $u : D^2 \rightarrow X$ with $u|_{\partial D^2} = \gamma$ and $\mu_{CZ}([\gamma, u]) = k$. Moreover, with the help of action functional $\mathcal{A}_H$, we can turn $CF_k(H, J)$ into a (finite dimensional) filtered vector space over $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ by defining the associated filtration function

$$\ell_H \left(\sum a_{[\gamma, u]} [\gamma, u] \right) = \max \{ \mathcal{A}_H([\gamma, u]) \mid a_{[\gamma, u]} \neq 0 \}.$$

Note that field $\Lambda^{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma}$ itself has a well-defined valuation by

$$v \left(\sum_{g \in \Gamma} a_g t^g \right) = \min \{g \in \mathbb{R} \mid a_g \neq 0\}.$$

Then for any $\lambda \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma}$ and $c \in CF_k(H, J)$, $\ell_H(\lambda c) = \ell_H(c) - v(\lambda)$.

Next, graded vector space $CF_*(H, J)$ will become a chain complex once we define the (Floer) boundary operator $(\partial_{H,J})_*$. Degree- k part of boundary operator $(\partial_{H,J})_k : CF_k(H, J) \rightarrow CF_{k-1}(H, J)$ is defined by counting the solution (modulo $\mathbb{R}$ -translation) of the following partial differential equation (as a formal negative gradient flow of $\mathcal{A}_H$)

$$(16) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + J_t(u(s, t)) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - X_H(t, u(s, t)) \right) = 0,$$

where $\{J_t\}_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ is a family of almost complex structure compatible with ω and $u : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow X$ such that

- u has finite energy $E(u) = \int_{\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \left| \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} \right|^2 dt ds$;
- u has asymptotic condition $u(s, \cdot) \rightarrow \gamma_{\pm}(\cdot)$ as $s \rightarrow \pm\infty$;
- $\mu_{CZ}([\gamma_-, w_-]) - \mu_{CZ}([\gamma_+, w_+]) = 1$ and $[\gamma_+, w_+] = [\gamma_+, w_- \# u]$.

By now, it is a not easy but well-known and standard fact that

Theorem 2.1 (See [HS95] for semi-positive X or see [Pa13] for general X). $(\partial_{H,J})_*$ is well-defined such that $\partial_{H,J} \circ \partial_{H,J} = 0$. Moreover, there exists some $\delta > 0$ (coming from Gromov-Floer compactness theorem) such that for each $c \in CF_*(H, J)$, $\ell_H(\partial_{H,J} c) \leq \ell_H(c) - \delta$.

Next, for filtered chain complex $(CF_*(H, J), (\partial_{H,J})_*, \ell_H)$, its construction clearly depends on the pair (H, J) . We will now recall the relation between two such filtered chain complexes if they are constructed from different (H, J) . Specifically, if we have (H_-, J_-) and (H_+, J_+) , the standard way is to form a (regular) homotopy $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{J})$ (with homotopy parameter $s \in \mathbb{R}$) between them so that when $s \ll 0$, $(\mathcal{H}_s, \mathcal{J}_s) = (H_-, J_-)$ and when $s \gg 0$, $(\mathcal{H}_s, \mathcal{J}_s) = (H_+, J_+)$. For instance, we can use a cut-off function $\alpha(s)$, i.e., $\alpha(s)$ is monotone increasing and $\alpha(s) = 0$ when $s \ll 0$ and $\alpha(s) = 1$ when $s \gg 0$, to form the following homotopy,

$$\mathcal{H}_s(t, \cdot) = (1 - \alpha(s))H_-(t, \cdot) + \alpha(s)(H_+(t, \cdot)),$$

and it is similar to consider a $\mathcal{J}_s$. The upshot is there exists a well-defined chain map (usually called *continuation map*) $\Phi_{(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{J})} : CF_*(H_-, J_-) \rightarrow CF_*(H_+, J_+)$ constructed (similar to (16)) by counting the solution of the following parametrized partial differential equation

$$(17) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + (J_t)_s(u(s, t)) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - X_{H_s}(t, u(s, t)) \right) = 0,$$

where again u is required to satisfy certain conditions as above except here we require $\mu_{CZ}([\gamma_-, u_-]) = \mu_{CZ}([\gamma_+, u_+])$. It is a chain map by standard Floer gluing argument, see proof of Theorem 11.1.15 in [AD14].

Remark 2.2. Here we emphasize that if we use another homotopy $(\mathcal{H}', \mathcal{J}')$, the same construction will give another chain map $\Phi_{(\mathcal{H}', \mathcal{J}')} : CF_*(H_-, J_-) \rightarrow CF_*(H_+, J_+)$. These two chain maps are actually chain homotopic to each other, induced by a “1-homotopy” (homotopy of a homotopy) between $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{J})$ and $(\mathcal{H}', \mathcal{J}')$. So there exists a degree-1 map $K : CF_*(H_-, J_-) \rightarrow CF_{*+1}(H_+, J_+)$ such that

$$(18) \quad \Phi_{(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{J})} - \Phi_{(\mathcal{H}', \mathcal{J}')} = \partial \circ K + K \circ \partial$$

The explicit construction of K is carried out in Lemma 6.3 in [Sal90]. Moreover, K shifts the filtration up to $\|H_+ - H_-\|_H$.

Now using another homotopy $(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{\mathcal{J}})$ from (H_+, J_+) to (H_-, J_-) gives a well-defined chain map $\Phi_{(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{\mathcal{J}})} : CF_*(H_+, J_+) \rightarrow CF_*(H_-, J_-)$. To sum up, we have the following picture,

$$(19) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathbb{I} & & \\ & \nearrow & & \searrow & \\ CF_*(H_-, J_-) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{J})}} & CF_*(H_+, J_+) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{\mathcal{J}})}} & CF_*(H_-, J_-) \end{array}$$

where identity map $\mathbb{I}$ can be regarded as the induced chain map by the obvious constant homotopy $(\mathcal{H}_{const}, \mathcal{J}_{const})$ between (H_-, J_-) and itself. On the one hand, the well-known gluing argument (see Chapter 10 in [MS04] or B.10 in [Pa13]) implies that

$$(20) \quad \Phi_{(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{\mathcal{J}})} \circ \Phi_{(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{J})} = \Phi_{(\mathcal{H}_R, \mathcal{J}_R)}$$

where the right hand side is an induced chain map from “gluing” homotopy $(\mathcal{H}_R, \mathcal{J}_R)$ (for some $R \gg 0$) from (H_-, J_-) to itself constructed from $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{J})$ and $(\tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{\mathcal{J}})$. On the other hand, it is also well-known (see explicit construction in Page 14 in [Ush11]) that the resulting $\Phi_{(\mathcal{H}_R, \mathcal{J}_R)}$ is chain homotopic to $\mathbb{I}$. This leads to the following two important consequences.

In terms of algebraic structure, different choices of pair (H, J) induce the same (up to isomorphism) Floer homology $H_*(CF(H, J), \partial_{H,J}) := HF_*(X)$. Therefore, we can compute $HF_*(X)$ by choosing a preferred Hamiltonian function H . In most cases, we will choose a C^2 -small H so the Hamiltonian orbit $\gamma(t)$ of H will be degenerated to points, which makes the corresponding analysis much easier. Moreover, we have

Theorem 2.3 (See Theorem 6.1 in [HS95] for semi-positive X or see Theorem 10.7.1 in [Pa13] for general X). *For any degree $k \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$HF_k(X) \simeq \bigoplus_{j=k \bmod 2N} H_j(X, \mathcal{K}) \otimes \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}.$$

In particular, when $k = 0$ or $\dim(X)$, $HF_k(X) \neq 0$.

In terms of filtration, neither chain maps in (19) nor the chain homotopy from $\Phi_{(\mathcal{H}_R, \mathcal{J}_R)}$ to $\mathbb{I}$ preserves the filtration. Instead, they have certain shifts related with the initial Hamiltonian functions H_- and H_+ . We will summarize this into the following short theorem with the help of terminology defined in Definition 1.12.

Theorem 2.4. *Given any two filtered Floer chain complexes $(CF_*(H_-, J_-), (\partial_{H_-, J_-})_*, \ell_{H_-})$ and $(CF_*(H_+, J_+), (\partial_{H_+, J_+})_*, \ell_{H_+})$, they are $(\int_0^1 \max_X (H_+ - H_-) dt, \int_0^1 -\min_X (H_+ - H_-) dt)$ -quasiequivalent.³*

Now we move to the Hamiltonian Floer theory with respect to non-contractible loop (represented by homotopy class α). We will denote the corresponding Floer chain complex as $CF_*(H, J)_\alpha$ and Floer homology as $HF_*(X)_\alpha$. We simply remark here that almost all the ingredients above can be defined and constructed in a parallel way by starting from a covering space of $\mathcal{L}_\alpha(X)$ once we fixed a reference non-contractible loop in the homotopy class α . The general construction has been carried out explicitly in Section 5 in [Ush13]. Proposition 5.1 in [Ush13] implies that Theorem 2.4 still holds for $CF_*(H, J)_\alpha$. What we want to emphasize is that Theorem 2.3 is not true for $HF_*(X)_\alpha$. In fact, we can readily show

Theorem 2.5. *$HF_*(X)_\alpha = 0$ if α is non-contractible.*

Indeed, since $HF_*(X)$ is independent of Hamiltonian H . A C^2 -small H will only provide critical points (as constant periodic orbits), which make $HF_*(X)_\alpha$ has no generators.

3. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.14

Lemma 3.1. *For any $a \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the following commuting diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{a}{p^2}})_\alpha & \xrightarrow{R_{p^2}} & CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{a+1}{p^2}})_\alpha \\ C_a \downarrow & & \downarrow (R_{p^2})_*(C_a) \\ CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{R_{p^2}} & CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p^2}})_\alpha \end{array}$$

where C_a is some continuation map.

Proof. Suppose $x(t+a/p^2)$ is a (capped) periodic orbit as a generator of $CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+a/p^2})_\alpha$ and suppose there exists a Floer connecting orbit $u(s, t)$ satisfying parametrized partial differential equation (17) connecting $x(t+a/p^2)$ and $y(t)$ for some $y(t)$ as a generator of $CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha$, followed by a rotation on the parameter t to $t+1/p^2$. In other words, we have

$$x(t+a/p^2) \xrightarrow{u(s,t)} y(t) \xrightarrow{R_{p^2}} y(t+1/p^2)$$

Then by rotating $u(s, t)$ to be $u(s, t+1/p^2)$, we will also get a Floer connecting orbit, namely $u(s, t+1/p^2)$, satisfying the following parametrized partial differential equation

³Here we choose normalized Hamiltonians H_+ and H_- in the sense that $\int_X H_+(t, \cdot) = \int_X H_-(t, \cdot) = 0$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$. Therefore, $\int_0^1 -\min_X (H_+ - H_-) dt \geq 0$.

(used to construct $(R_p)_*(C_\alpha)$),

$$(21) \quad \frac{\partial u}{\partial s} + (J_{t+1/p})_s(u(s, t)) \left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} - X_{H_s}(t + 1/p^2, u(s, t)) \right) = 0,$$

connecting $x(t + (a + 1)/p^2)$ and $y(t + 1/p^2)$. In other words,

$$x(t + a/p^2) \xrightarrow{R_{p^2}} x(t + (a + 1)/p^2) \xrightarrow{u(s, t+1/p^2)} y(t + 1/p^2)$$

By a symmetric argument, there is a one-to-one correspondence between these two approaches. Therefore, this diagram commutes by definition of Floer continuation map. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 1.14. Because R_{p^2} is well-defined, consider composition $C_1 \circ R_{p^2}$ (which is a map on $CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha$ itself). We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (C_1 \circ R_{p^2}) \circ (C_1 \circ R_{p^2}) &= C_1 \circ (R_{p^2} \circ C_1) \circ R_{p^2} \\ &= C_1 \circ ((R_{p^2})_*(C_1) \circ R_{p^2}) \circ R_{p^2} \\ &= (C_1 \circ (R_{p^2})_*(C_1)) \circ R_{p^2}^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality comes from Lemma 3.1. By setting

$$C_2 = C_1 \circ (R_{p^2})_*(C_1)$$

we have $(C_1 \circ R_{p^2})^2 = C_2 \circ R_{p^2}^2$. Applying Lemma 3.1 inductively, we can get

$$(C_1 \circ R_{p^2})^p = C_p \circ R_{p^2}^p = C_p \circ R_p$$

where C_p is recursively defined by

$$C_p = C_1 \circ (R_{p^2})_*(C_{p-1}).$$

Therefore, in order to get the conclusion, set $C = C_p$ (that is determined by C_1) and set $C' = C_1$ so $S = C_1 \circ R_{p^2}$. $\square$

4. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.17

We will prove Proposition 1.17 by proving the following general result first. Recall double map $\mathcal{D}_\Phi$ on self-mapping cone $\text{Cone}_C(\Phi)_*$ is defined by, for any $(x, y) \in \text{Cone}_C(\Phi)_*$,

$$\mathcal{D}_\Phi((x, y)) = (\Phi(x), \Phi(y)).$$

Lemma 4.1. *For two filtration preserving chain maps Φ and Ψ on filtered chain complex (C_*, ∂_*, ℓ) , if Φ and Ψ are filtered homotopic to each other, then the associated self-mapping cones $\text{Cone}_C(\Phi)_*$ and $\text{Cone}_C(\Psi)_*$ are filtered isomorphic to each other.*

Proof. Suppose the chain homotopy between Φ and Ψ is K , which preserves the filtration. Construct a map $F : \text{Cone}_C(\Phi)_* \rightarrow \text{Cone}_C(\Psi)_*$ by

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I} & -K \\ 0 & \mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix}.$$

First F preserves filtration. In fact, for any $(x, y) \in \text{Cone}_C(\Phi)_*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{co}(F(x, y)) &= \ell_{co}((x - Ky, y)) = \max\{\ell_C(x - Ky), \ell_C(y)\} \\ &\leq \max\{\ell_C(x), \ell_C(Ky), \ell_C(y)\} \\ &= \max\{\ell_C(x), \ell_C(y)\} \\ &= \ell_{co}((x, y)). \end{aligned}$$

Second, F is a chain map because

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I} & -K \\ 0 & \mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \partial_C & -\Phi \\ 0 & -\partial_C \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial_C & -\Phi + K\partial_C \\ 0 & -\partial_C \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial_C & -\Psi - \partial_C K \\ 0 & -\partial_C \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_C & -\Psi \\ 0 & -\partial_C \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I} & -K \\ 0 & \mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Third, F is an isomorphism because we have its inverse

$$F^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I} & K \\ 0 & \mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix}$$

which is easily seen to preserve the filtration too. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 1.17. For the first conclusion, by standard result of Floer theory explained Section 2, different choices of continuation maps C_1 and C_2 will result in different but filtered homotopic chain maps. Therefore, it comes from the direct application of Lemma 4.1 to

$$\Phi = C_1 \circ R_p - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi = C_2 \circ R_p - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}.$$

For the second conclusion, note that for the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{R_p} & CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p}})_\alpha & \xrightarrow{C} & CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \\ \partial_k \downarrow & & \downarrow (R_p)_*(\partial_k) & & \downarrow \partial_k \\ CF_{k-1}(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{R_p} & CF_{k-1}(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p}})_\alpha & \xrightarrow{C} & CF_{k-1}(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \end{array}$$

the associated gluing diagram (see Lemma 3.10 in [Sal97]) is

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} x^\alpha(t) & \longrightarrow & x^\alpha(t + 1/p) & \longrightarrow & x^\beta(t) \\ \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\ y^\alpha(t) & \longrightarrow & y^\alpha(t + 1/p) & \longrightarrow & y^\beta(t) \end{array}$$

which confirms that 1-dimensional moduli space $\mathcal{M}(x^\alpha(t), y^\beta(t))$ has its boundary

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcup_{y^\alpha(t)} \mathcal{M}(x^\alpha(t), y^\alpha(t), H^{(p)}) \times \mathcal{M}(y^\alpha(t), y^\beta(t), \mathcal{J}) \\ \cup \bigcup_{x^\beta(t)} \mathcal{M}(x^\alpha(t), x^\beta(t), \mathcal{J}) \times \mathcal{M}(x^\beta(t), y^\beta(t), H^{(p)}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{J}$ is a composition homotopy of homotopies arising from J_t to $J_{t+\frac{1}{p}}$ (by rotation R_p) and then from $J_{t+\frac{1}{p}}$ back to J_t (by continuation C). Therefore, by compactness of $\mathcal{M}(x^\alpha(t), y^\beta(t))$, $T = C \circ R_p$ commutes with ∂_k . Similarly, $S = C' \circ R_{p^2}$ commutes with ∂_k for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then by definition of ∂_{co} , we can check

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} T & 0 \\ 0 & T \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial T & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \circ T \\ 0 & -\partial T \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} T \partial & -T \circ (T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -T \partial \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} T & 0 \\ 0 & T \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, since S commutes with T ,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & S \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial S & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \circ S \\ 0 & -\partial S \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} S \partial & -S \circ (T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -S \partial \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} S & 0 \\ 0 & S \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

□

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.18

Recall our set-up. For any given Hamiltonian H , there is a Floer chain complex $(CF_*(H^{(p)}, J_t), \partial_{H,J})$. Its self-mapping cone of linear map $T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}$, $(Cone_*(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}), \partial_{co})$, is in general a filtered chain complex over Novikov field $\Lambda^{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma}$ where T is a strictly lower filtration perturbation of rotation R_p , i.e., $T = C \circ R_p = R_p + P$ where for any x from domain, $\ell(P(x)) < \ell(x)$. Moreover, there exists a $\Lambda^{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma}$ -linear chain map $\mathcal{D}_T$ on $(Cone_*(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}), \partial_{co})$, defined as an action of T on each component. If in the p -th power situation defined in the introduction, there exists a $\Lambda^{\mathcal{H}, \Gamma}$ -linear chain map $\mathcal{D}_S$ on $(Cone_*(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}), \partial_{co})$ such that $\mathcal{D}_S^p = \mathcal{D}_T$ where S is a strictly lower filtration perturbation of rotation R_{p^2} . In this section, we will prove the important Theorem 1.18,

5.1. Reduce to a group action. Recall our definitions,

$$(22) \quad \mathcal{D}_T = \mathcal{D}_{R_p} + C_T \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_S = \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}} + C_S$$

and by Proposition 1.17,

$$(23) \quad \mathcal{D}_T \partial_{co} = \partial_{co} \mathcal{D}_T \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_S \partial_{co} = \partial_{co} \mathcal{D}_S$$

because $T \partial = \partial T$ and $S \partial = \partial S$. In particular, we know $\mathcal{D}_T$ and $\mathcal{D}_S$ exactly preserves filtration. Moreover, due to Floer continuation map, there exists a constant $\hbar > 0$ such that for any $x \in Cone_*(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I})$,

$$(24) \quad \ell_{co}(C_T x) \leq \ell(x) - \hbar \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_{co}(C_S x) \leq \ell(x) - \hbar.$$

Because of this, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. $\mathcal{D}_T$ and $\mathcal{D}_S$ (if it exists) are invertible.

Proof. First, because $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}^p = \mathbb{I}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}^{p^2} = \mathbb{I}$,

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{D}_T^p = \mathbb{I} - Q_T \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_S^{p^2} = \mathbb{I} - Q_S$$

where Q_T is a combination of C_T and $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$, so strictly lowers filtration (by at least $\hbar$) and Q_S is a combination of C_S and $\mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}$, so also strictly lowers filtration (by at least $\hbar$). Then $\mathcal{D}_T \circ (\mathcal{D}_T)^p = (\mathcal{D}_T)^{p+1} = (\mathcal{D}_T)^p \circ \mathcal{D}_T$, so by (25),

$$(26) \quad \mathcal{D}_T \circ (\mathbb{I} - Q_T) = (\mathbb{I} - Q_T) \circ \mathcal{D}_T \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_T Q_T = Q_T \mathcal{D}_T.$$

Similarly, $\mathcal{D}_S \circ (\mathcal{D}_S)^{p^2} = (\mathcal{D}_S)^{p^2+1} = (\mathcal{D}_S)^{p^2} \circ \mathcal{D}_S$, so by (25),

$$(27) \quad \mathcal{D}_S \circ (\mathbb{I} - Q_S) = (\mathbb{I} - Q_S) \circ \mathcal{D}_S \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_S Q_S = Q_S \mathcal{D}_S.$$

For $\mathcal{D}_T$, on the one hand, we can define

$$B_T = (\mathbb{I} - Q_T)^{-1} = \mathbb{I} + Q_T + Q_T^2 + \dots$$

It is a well-defined operator over $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ because by (24) $\ell(Q_T^k(x))$ diverges to $-\infty$ (as $k \rightarrow \infty$) for any x . Moreover, by (26), $B_T \mathcal{D}_T = \mathcal{D}_T B_T$. On the other hand, for operator $B'_T = (\mathcal{D}_T)^{p-1} B_T$, we know

$$\mathcal{D}_T B'_T = (\mathcal{D}_T)^p B_T = (\mathbb{I} - Q_T)(\mathbb{I} - Q_T)^{-1} = \mathbb{I} = (\mathcal{D}_T)^{p-1} B_T \mathcal{D}_T = B'_T \mathcal{D}_T.$$

Therefore, B'_T is the required inverse of $\mathcal{D}_T$. Similarly for $\mathcal{D}_S$, we can define

$$B'_S = (\mathcal{D}_S)^{p^2-1} B_S \quad \text{where} \quad B_S = (\mathbb{I} - Q_S)^{-1} = \mathbb{I} + Q_S + Q_S^2 + \dots$$

and then $\mathcal{D}_S B'_S = B'_S \mathcal{D}_S$, so B'_S is the desired inverse of $\mathcal{D}_S$. $\square$

Remark 5.2. Note that T and S also satisfy perturbed group relations in the form of (25), therefore, the same argument in Lemma 5.1 implies both T and S are invertible too.

Note that by (25), $\mathcal{D}_T$ and $\mathcal{D}_S$ do not generate finite group action. However, from the following lemma, these can always be reduced to be group actions.

Lemma 5.3. *There exists T' and S' such that $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{S'}$ are group actions, that is,*

$$\mathcal{D}_{T'}^p = \mathbb{I} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{S'}^p = \mathcal{D}_{T'} \quad (\text{so } \mathcal{D}_S^{p^2} = \mathbb{I}).$$

Moreover, T' and S' are strictly lower filtration perturbations of T and S respectively.

Proof. Denote $T^p = \mathbb{I} - P_T$ where $\ell(P_T x) \leq \ell(x) - \hbar$ for any x . We want to find T' such that $(T')^p = (T^p + P_T) = \mathbb{I}$. Since T is invertible by Remark 5.2, define

$$P_T^{(1)} = T^{-p} P_T \quad \text{and} \quad T' = T(\mathbb{I} + P_T^{(1)})^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

where $(\mathbb{I} + P_T^{(1)})^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is defined using the binomial expansion, that is,

$$(\mathbb{I} + P_T^{(1)})^{\frac{1}{p}} = \mathbb{I} + \binom{\frac{1}{p}}{1} P_T^{(1)} + \binom{\frac{1}{p}}{2} (P_T^{(1)})^2 + \dots := \mathbb{I} + P_T^{(2)}$$

where $P_T^{(2)} = \binom{1}{p}P_T^{(1)} + \binom{1}{2}(P_T^{(1)})^2 + \dots$ and it defines an operator over $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$. Hence, denote $P_T^{(3)} = TP_T^{(2)}$,

$$T' = T + P_T^{(3)}$$

which is the required (group action) T' such that it is a strictly lower filtration perturbation of T . Moreover, $\mathcal{D}_{T'}^p = \mathcal{D}_{(T')^p} = \mathcal{D}_{\mathbb{I}} = \mathbb{I}$.

Now suppose $T = S^p$. We want to find S' such that $(S')^p = T' = T + P_T^{(3)}$. Again, by Remark 5.2, define

$$P_S^{(1)} = S^{-p}P_T^{(3)} \quad \text{and} \quad S' = S(\mathbb{I} + P_S^{(1)})^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

where $(\mathbb{I} + P_S^{(1)})^{\frac{1}{p}}$ is defined using the binomial expansion, that is

$$(\mathbb{I} + P_S^{(1)})^{\frac{1}{p}} = \mathbb{I} + \binom{1}{p}P_S^{(1)} + \binom{1}{2}(P_S^{(1)})^2 + \dots := \mathbb{I} + P_S^{(2)}$$

where $P_S^{(2)} = \binom{1}{p}P_S^{(1)} + \binom{1}{2}(P_S^{(1)})^2 + \dots$. Denote $P_S^{(3)} = SP_S^{(2)}$,

$$S' = S + P_S^{(3)}$$

which is the required (group action) S' such that it is a strictly lower filtration perturbation of S . Moreover, $\mathcal{D}_{S'}^p = \mathcal{D}_{(S')^p} = \mathcal{D}_{T'}$. $\square$

To simplify the notation of proofs below, denote $[\cdot, \cdot]$ as commutator (of two matrices or operators). So A and B commutes if and only if $[A, B] = 0$. An important observation from definition of T is $[T, P_T] = [P_T, T] = 0$. Then we have

Corollary 5.4. *For $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{S'}$ constructed from Lemma 5.3, we have $[\mathcal{D}_{T'}, \partial_{co}] = 0$ and $[\mathcal{D}_{S'}, \partial_{co}] = 0$.*

Proof. First, we claim $[T', \partial] = 0$ and $[S', \partial] = 0$. In fact, starting from $[T, \partial] = 0$ and the definitions of $P_T^{(1)}$, $P_T^{(2)}$ and $P_T^{(3)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [T, \partial] = 0 &\Rightarrow [P_T, \partial] = 0 \Rightarrow [P_T^{(1)}, \partial] = 0 \Rightarrow [P_T^{(2)}, \partial] = 0 \\ &\Rightarrow [P_T^{(3)}, \partial] = 0 \Rightarrow [T', \partial] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for S' , starting from $[S, \partial] = 0$, $[P_T^{(3)}, \partial] = 0$ and definitions of $P_S^{(1)}$, $P_S^{(2)}$ and $P_S^{(3)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} ([S, \partial] = 0, [P_T^{(3)}, \partial] = 0) &\Rightarrow [P_S^{(1)}, \partial] = 0 \Rightarrow [P_S^{(2)}, \partial] = 0 \\ &\Rightarrow [P_S^{(3)}, \partial] = 0 \Rightarrow [S', \partial] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Second, we claim $[T', T] = 0$ and $[S', T] = 0$. In fact, starting from $[P_T, T] = 0$, we have

$$[P_T, T] = 0 \Rightarrow [P_T^{(1)}, T] = 0 \Rightarrow [P_T^{(2)}, T] = 0 \Rightarrow [P_T^{(3)}, T] = 0 \Rightarrow [T', T] = 0.$$

Similar for S' , starting from $[S, T] = 0$ and $[P_T^{(3)}, T] = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} ([S, T] = 0, [P_T^{(3)}, T] = 0) &\Rightarrow [P_S^{(1)}, T] = 0 \Rightarrow [P_S^{(2)}, T] \\ &\Rightarrow [P_S^{(3)}, T] = 0 \Rightarrow [S', T] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Third, we conclude $[\mathcal{D}_{T'}, \partial_{co}] = 0$ and $[\mathcal{D}_{S'}, \partial_{co}] = 0$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} T' & 0 \\ 0 & T' \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} T' \partial & -T'(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial T' \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial T' & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) T' \\ 0 & -\partial T' \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} T' & 0 \\ 0 & T' \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality comes from the first part of two claims above. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} S' & 0 \\ 0 & S' \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} S' \partial & -S'(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial S' \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial S' & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) S' \\ 0 & -\partial S' \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} S' & 0 \\ 0 & S' \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality comes from the second part of two claims above. $\square$

Remark 5.5. Since $\mathcal{D}_T$ is a strictly lower filtration perturbation of $\mathcal{D}_{R^p}$, so is $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ by its construction. Similarly, $\mathcal{D}_{S'}$ is a strictly lower filtration perturbation of $\mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}$. For orthogonality, strictly lower filtration perturbation behaves well as proved by the following easy lemma which will be used often later.

Lemma 5.6. *Strictly lower filtration perturbation preserves orthogonality. Specifically, given a set of orthogonal elements over $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$, say $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and any strictly lower filtration for each v_i , that is $v_i + w_i$ where $\ell(w_i) < \ell(v_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$,*

$$\{v_1 + w_1, \dots, v_n + w_n\} \text{ are orthogonal over } \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}.$$

Proof. For any $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$,

$$\ell(\lambda_1(v_1 + w_1) + \dots + \lambda_n(v_n + w_n)) = \ell(\lambda_1 v_1 + \dots + \lambda_n v_n) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\ell(\lambda_i v_i)\} = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\ell(\lambda_i(v_i + w_i))\}.$$

So $\{v_1 + w_1, \dots, v_n + w_n\}$ are also orthogonal. $\square$

5.2. Preparation.

5.2.1. Orthogonal invariant complement.

Proposition 5.7. *Suppose V is acted by a group action T such that $T^p = \mathbb{I}$ and it exactly preserves filtration. For any T -invariant subspace V_1 , there exists an orthogonal complementary T -invariant W in the sense that V_1 is orthogonal to W and $V = V_1 \oplus W$.*

Recall if vector space V is a representation of a group G satisfying condition that the field of scalars for V has its ⁴

$$(28) \quad \text{char}(\mathcal{K}) \nmid |G|$$

then given any G -invariant subspace $V_1 \leq V$, there exists a G -invariant complementary subspace $W \leq V$. Actually we can construct W explicitly.

Construction 5.8. Taking any complement of V_1 (in the sense of vector space, no orthogonality is involved and not necessarily G -invariant), say U , consider the projection map $\pi_{V_1} : V \rightarrow V_1$ with respect to the decomposition $V = V_1 \oplus U$, and define

$$(29) \quad W = \ker \left(\frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} g \cdot \pi_{V_1} \cdot g^{-1} \right).$$

It is easy to check that W is G -invariant for any $g \in G$ and $\dim W = \dim U$. There is a useful observation that (29) implies each $x \in W$ satisfies

$$\frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} g(\mathbb{I} - \pi_U)g^{-1}(x) = 0.$$

Therefore, we have

$$(30) \quad x = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} g \cdot \pi_U \cdot g^{-1}(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in W.$$

In order to get Proposition 5.7, we need to show W is orthogonal to V_1 . We will use the following lemma from [UZ15],

Lemma 5.9. *Let (V, ℓ) be a filtered vector space over $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ and let $V_1, U, W \leq V$ be such that U is an orthogonal complement to V_1 and $\dim(U) = \dim(W)$. Consider the projection $\pi_U : V \rightarrow U$ associated to the direct sum decomposition $V = U \oplus V_1$. Then W is an orthogonal complement of V_1 if and only if $\ell(\pi_U x) = \ell(x)$ for all $x \in W$.*

Proof of Proposition 5.7. Let U be the orthogonal complement of V_1 that is used in the Construction 5.8. By Lemma 5.9, we will need to show for any $x \in W$, $\ell(x) = \ell(\pi_U x)$. Decompose $x = u + v$ where $u \in U$ and $v \in V_1$. By (30), we have

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \frac{1}{p} \left(\pi_U x + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} T^i \pi_U T^{p-i} x \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \left(u + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} T^i \pi_U T^{p-i} u \right). \end{aligned}$$

⁴See Theorem 4.1 and it equivalent conclusion like Lemma 2.2.11 in [Kow13]). Non-division between characteristic of working field and order of group is the only hypothesis. When we apply to Novikov field $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ and group G with order p here, $\text{char}(\mathcal{K}) \neq p$ implies $\text{char}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}) \neq p$. Therefore it satisfies this hypothesis.

The key step for the second line is that since V_1 is invariant, $\pi_U T^{p-i}(u+v) = \pi_U T^{p-i}u + \pi_U T^{p-i}v = \pi_U T^{p-i}u$ because $\pi_U T^{p-i}v = 0$. So we can write v in terms of u , that is

$$v = -\frac{p-1}{p}u + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} T^i \pi_U T^{p-i}u.$$

Because T exactly preserves filtration and U is orthogonal to V_1 , it follows that $\ell(v) \leq \ell(u)$. Therefore,

$$\ell(x) = \max\{\ell(u), \ell(v)\} = \ell(u) = \ell(\pi_U x).$$

Therefore, we get the conclusion. $\square$

Example 5.10. For group action (guaranteed by Lemma 5.3) $\mathcal{D}_{T'} : \text{Cone}_k(T - \xi \cdot \mathbb{I}) \rightarrow \text{Cone}_k(T - \xi \cdot \mathbb{I})$, since $\ker(\partial_{c_0})$ is a $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ -invariant subspace of $\text{Cone}_k(T - \xi \cdot \mathbb{I})$ by Corollary 5.4, there exists an orthogonal complement of $\ker(\partial_{c_0})$ in $\text{Cone}_k(T - \xi \cdot \mathbb{I})$, denoted as W which is also $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ -invariant.

5.2.2. Restriction to 0-level. In this subsection, we will work on the vector space over universal Novikov field, that is, for $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$, $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}$. The advantage is that we can always rescale preferred element x in the vector space such that $\ell(x) = 0$. Moreover, since we have seen that our obstruction (see Definition 1.19) will be constructed only from generalized boundary depth (which does not involve the specific value of end points), By Proposition 6.8 in [UZ15], it will be invariant under the coefficient extension.

From the idea of [Ush08], any orthogonalizable $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$ -space (V, ℓ) can be identified with $((\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}})^n, -\vec{v})$ (for some $n = \dim_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}} V \in \mathbb{N}$) under an orthonormal basis, where $\ell(v) = -\vec{v}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ if v is identified with a vector $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ under this basis. Therefore, for such V , we can associated a $\mathcal{K}$ -module

$$[V] = V_{\leq 0} / V_{< 0}$$

where

$$V_{\leq 0} := \{v \in V \mid \ell(v) \leq 0\} \text{ and } V_{< 0} := \{v \in V \mid \ell(v) < 0\}.$$

In particular, denote $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} = \{\lambda \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}} \mid v(\lambda) \geq 0\}$ and $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}_{> 0}} = \{\lambda \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}} \mid v(\lambda) > 0\}$. Note that $\mathcal{K} \simeq \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} / \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}_{> 0}}$. There is a quotient projection $\pi : V_{\leq 0} \rightarrow [V]$ by, roughly speaking, taking the 0-level filtration term, that is, for $\lambda \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$,

$$(31) \quad \lambda = \sum_g a_g T^g \xrightarrow{\pi} a_0$$

Then we can show

Lemma 5.11. A $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$ -orthonormal set $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ reduces to a $\mathcal{K}$ -linearly independent set $\{[e_1], \dots, [e_n]\}$ under projection π defined in (31). Conversely, for a set $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ over $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$, if its reduction $\{[e_1], \dots, [e_n]\}$ are $\mathcal{K}$ -linearly independent, then $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ are $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$ -orthogonal. Therefore, in particular, $[V] = (\mathcal{K})^{\dim_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}} V}$.

Proof. Suppose $\{[e_1], \dots, [e_n]\}$ are not $\mathcal{K}$ -linearly independent. There exists $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_n \in \mathcal{K}$, not all zero, such that

$$\eta_1[e_1] + \dots + \eta_n[e_n] = 0.$$

Then

$$\eta_1 e_1 + \dots + \eta_n e_n = \eta_1 [e_1] + \dots + \eta_n [e_n] + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{strictly lower} \\ \text{filtration terms} \end{array} \right\}.$$

So

$$\ell(\eta_1 e_1 + \dots + \eta_n e_n) < 0 = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\ell(e_i) - v(\eta_i)\}.$$

Therefore, $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ are not $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$ -orthogonal.

Conversely, suppose $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ are not $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$ -orthogonal. There exist $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$, not all zero, such that

$$\ell(\lambda_1 e_1 + \dots + \lambda_n e_n) < \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{\ell(e_i) - v(\lambda_i)\} = 0 - \min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{v(\lambda_i)\}.$$

If we rescale λ_i on both sides such that $\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{v(\lambda_i)\} = 0$, then still we have the inequality. However, reducing to the 0-filtration level, which is the highest filtration level, we have

$$[\lambda_1][e_1] + \dots + [\lambda_n][e_n] = 0 \text{ where } [\lambda_i] \text{ in } \mathcal{K}.$$

Because of our rescaling, not all $[\lambda_i]$ are zero, which means $\{[e_1], \dots, [e_n]\}$ are not $\mathcal{K}$ -linearly independent.

In particular, if $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ is an $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$ -orthonormal basis of V , then $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}[V] \geq n$. Meanwhile, $[V]$ is a submodule of $[\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}]^n = \mathcal{K}^n$. So $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}[V] = n = \dim_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}} V$. $\square$

Not only can we reduce spaces, but also we can reduce maps. For a $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$ -linear map A on (V, ℓ) which is exact filtration preserving (for instance, $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ or $\mathcal{D}_{S'}$), under an orthonormal basis, $A \in M_{n \times n}(\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}})$. Note that then $A(V_{<0}) \leq A_{<0}$ which implies we have a well-defined reduced map of A , denoted as $[A]$,

$$[A] : [V] \rightarrow [V].$$

Example 5.12. Suppose under an orthonormal basis,

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 1+t^2 & t^6 & t^2+t^4 \\ t^4 & 2 & t^6-t^{10} \\ 2 & t^2 & 5+t^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$[A] = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 5 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Example 5.13. Suppose A is exact filtration preserving and $\lambda \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{R}}$,

$$A^n = \lambda \cdot \mathbb{I} \xrightarrow{\text{reduces to}} [A]^n = [\lambda] \cdot \mathbb{I}.$$

In particular, for any $x \in V$, $Ax = \lambda x$ reduces to $[A][x] = [\lambda][x]$.

5.2.3. Irreducible condition.

Lemma 5.14. $\mathcal{K}$ satisfies “irreducible condition” if and only if $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ satisfies “irreducible condition”.

Proof. One direction “ $\Leftarrow$ ” is trivial because $\mathcal{K} \hookrightarrow \Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$. We will just prove the other one “ $\Rightarrow$ ”. Suppose not. Then there exists some $x \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ and number q such that

$$(32) \quad x^p = \xi_p^q$$

but p does not divide q . The general form of x is $x = a_m t^{\lambda_m} + a_{m+1} t^{\lambda_{m+1}} + \dots$ where $a_m \neq 0$ and $\lambda_m < \lambda_{m+1} < \dots$ (which diverges to infinity). If $\lambda_m \neq 0$, then

$$x^p = a_m^p t^{p\lambda_m} + \dots$$

such that the lowest degree $p\lambda_m$ is either strictly positive or strictly negative, which by equation (32) above, forces $a_m^p = 0$. So $a_m = 0$. Contradiction. Now we are left to the case that $\lambda_m = 0$, so we may rewrite x as $x = a_m + a_{m+1} t^{\lambda_1} + \dots$ where $a_m \in \mathcal{K}$. Therefore, (32) implies $a_m^p = \xi_p^q$ which contradicts the hypothesis that $\mathcal{K}$ satisfies “irreducible condition”. $\square$

Here comes a perturbed version of the lemma above, which will be used later.

Lemma 5.15. Suppose $\mathcal{K}$ satisfies “irreducible condition”. For any $g(x) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma>0}[x]$ with $\deg(g(x)) < p$,

$$x^p = 1 + h(x) \text{ is solvable in } \Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma};$$

while for any q not divisible by p ,

$$x^p = \xi_p^q + h(x) \text{ is not solvable in } \Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}.$$

Proof. The second conclusion is easier to prove. Suppose it is solvable with some solution x . Then $\ell(x)$ is necessarily 0. So reduced to $[V]$,

$$[x]^p = \xi_p^q$$

for some q not divisible by p in $\mathcal{K}$. This contradicts to the condition that $\mathcal{K}$ satisfies “irreducible condition”.

For the first conclusion, we will run an inductive process to solve x piece by piece. First note that since $\ell(x)$ is necessarily 0, we can write

$$x = a_0 t^{g_0} + a_1 t^{g_1} + a_2 t^{g_2} + \dots$$

where $g_0 = 0$ and $g_i > 0$ for any $i \geq 1$. Moreover, we arrange the exponents to be in a strictly increasing order, that is, $g_i < g_{i+1}$, which, by definition, diverge to infinity. Denote $G_x = \{g_i \mid g_i \text{ is an exponent of } x\}$. Then denote

$$S = \left\{ \sum_{g \in G_x} n_g g \mid n_g \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \right\}.$$

Note that for any given number $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, there are only finitely many linear combinations from S whose values are no greater than λ (so S is discrete). Therefore, it makes sense to define, for any $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, s_n representing the n -th smallest combination from

S. For example, $s_0 = 0 = g_0$ and $s_1 = g_1$. It's not clear in general what the expression of s_n is, but for sure, $s_n \leq g_n$ because there might be combination of smaller terms still not exceeding g_n .

Now denote $V_{<s_k} = \{v \in V \mid \ell(v) < -s_k\}$ and projection $\pi_{s_k} : V_{\leq 0} \rightarrow V_{\leq 0}/V_{<s_k}$. Note when $k = 0$, $\pi_{s_k} = \pi$ defined in (31). For initial step, apply π_{s_0} to $x^p = 1 + h(x)$ and we get

$$(\pi_{s_0} x)^p = 1 + \pi_{s_0}(h(x)),$$

that is, $a_0^p = 1$. Indeed, $\pi_{s_0}(h(x)) = 0$ because by definition of $h(x)$, each of its coefficients has valuation strictly bigger than 0 which implies the lowest valuation of $h(x)$ is strictly bigger than s_0 . Since $\mathcal{K}$ contains all the p -th root of unity, we can solve a_0 . Suppose for s_n , we can solved $a_0, \dots, a_{m(n)}$ for some $m(n) \in \mathbb{N}$. For s_{n+1} , there are two cases. Either, there is no new coefficient a_i appearing to be solved. Then we are done with this step and then move to s_{n+2} . Or new $a_{m(n)+1}$ appears. However, new $a_{m(n)+1}$ always appears in accompany with its formal power $t^{g_{m(n)+1}}$ and the lowest exponent it contributes is $pa_0^{p-1}a_{m(n)+1}t^{g_{m(n)+1}}$. Moreover, as this term is not in the previous inductive step, we know $(s_n <) g_{m(n)+1} = s_{n+1}$ by definition of s_i . Therefore,

$$(\pi_{s_{n+1}} x)^p = F(a_0, \dots, a_{m(n)}, t) + pa_0^{p-1}a_{m(n)+1}t^{g_{m(n)+1}},$$

where $F(a_0, \dots, a_{m(n)}, t)$ is some combination of $a_0, \dots, a_{m(n)}$ and powers of t with exponents no greater than s_{n+1} .

On the other hand, from the similar reason as above, $\pi_{s_{n+1}}(h(x))$ will not contain any $a_{n(m)+1}$ (or any $i \geq n(m) + 1$) because the lowest exponent it contributes from its formal power is already bigger than s_{n+1} . Therefore,

$$1 + \pi_{s_{n+1}}(h(x)) = 1 + G(a_0, \dots, a_{m(n)}, t),$$

where $G(a_0, \dots, a_{m(n)}, t)$ is some combination of $a_0, \dots, a_{m(n)}$ and powers of t with exponents no greater than s_{n+1} . From the inductive step of s_n , we have already known $a_0, \dots, a_{m(n)}$ and the following equation

$$F(a_0, \dots, a_{m(n)}, t) + pa_0^{p-1}a_{m(n)+1}t^{g_{m(n)+1}} = G(a_0, \dots, a_{m(n)}, t)$$

is linear on $a_{m(n)+1}$, therefore, $a_{m(n)+1}$ can be solved. $\square$

From now on, we will always assume $\mathcal{K}$ satisfies "irreducible condition" and $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}$. For brevity, we introduce the following notation.

Definition 5.16. For any $x \in V$ and an operator A such that $A^p = \lambda \cdot \mathbb{I}$ for some scalar $\lambda \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$, we denote

$$V_x = \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle x, Ax, \dots, A^{p-1}x \rangle$$

and call it *the cyclic span (of A) by x*.

Note that by Lemma 5.14 and Lemma 4.15 in [PS14], if $\lambda = \xi_p^q$ for $1 \leq q \leq p-1$, we know $\{x, Ax, \dots, A^{p-1}x\}$ are $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ -linearly independent, so $\dim_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} V_x = p$. However, we can get a stronger result as follows.

Corollary 5.17. *Let V be a $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -vector space associated with an $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -linear exact filtration preserving operator A such that*

$$A^p = \xi_p^q \cdot \mathbb{I}$$

for $1 \leq q \leq p-1$. Then for any $x \in V$, $\{x, Ax, \dots, A^{p-1}x\}$ are $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -orthogonal.

Proof. Rescale x such that $\ell(x) = 0$ if necessary. The cyclic span V_x of A is an A -invariant subspace. Then, $[V_x]$ is an $[A]$ -invariant subspace where

$$[V_x] = \text{span}_{\mathcal{K}} \langle [x], [A][x], \dots, [A]^{p-1}[x] \rangle$$

is a cyclic span of $[x]$ since $[A]^p = \xi_p^q \cdot \mathbb{I}$. Because $\mathcal{K}$ satisfies “irreducible condition”, we know $p \mid \dim_{\mathcal{K}} [V_x]$. But $\dim_{\mathcal{K}} [V_x] \leq p$. The rigidity $\dim_{\mathcal{K}} [V_x] = p$ implies $\{[x], [A][x], \dots, [A]^{p-1}[x]\}$ are $\mathcal{K}$ -linearly independent. By Lemma 5.11, $\{x, Ax, \dots, A^{p-1}x\}$ are $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -orthogonal. $\square$

Corollary 5.18. *Under condition of Corollary 5.17, if $y \in V$ is $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -orthogonal to V_x , then cyclic span V_y is $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -orthogonal to V_x .*

Proof. Rescale y and x such that $\ell(x) = \ell(y) = 0$ if necessary. By Lemma 5.11, condition y being $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -orthogonal to V_x implies $[y]$ being $\mathcal{K}$ -linearly independent from cyclic $\mathcal{K}$ -span $[V_x]$. We claim

$$\{[y], [A][y], \dots, [A]^{p-1}[y], [x], [A][x], \dots, [A]^{p-1}[x]\}$$

are $\mathcal{K}$ -linearly independent. In fact, $\mathcal{K}$ -span of all these reduced $2p$ elements, denoted as $V_{x,y}$, is an $[A]$ -invariant subspace. By “irreducible condition”, its dimension is either p or $2p$. If it is p , then, by Corollary 5.18,

$$\dim_{\mathcal{K}}([V_y] \cap [V_x]) = \dim_{\mathcal{K}} [V_y] + \dim_{\mathcal{K}} [V_x] - \dim_{\mathcal{K}} V_{x,y} = p + p - p = p.$$

Then since p is prime, $[V_y] = [V_x]$, which is a contradiction. Then by Lemma 5.11, the original $2p$ elements $\{y, \dots, A^{p-1}y, x, \dots, A^{p-1}x\}$ are $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -orthogonal. So, in particular, V_y is $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -orthogonal to V_x . $\square$

Remark 5.19. Note that in the situation of both Corollary 5.17 and Corollary 5.18, if A satisfies $A^p = \mathbb{I}$ (that is $q = 0$), then we can't directly conclude that $\{x, Ax, \dots, A^{p-1}x\}$ are $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -orthogonal (even $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -linearly independent) because “irreducible condition” does not apply here. To get the expected result on the multiplicity of p , more structure of self-mapping cone will be used later.

5.2.4. Filtration optimal pair. The following lemma is key to construct singular value decomposition later. ⁵

Lemma 5.20. *Let (V_1, ℓ_1) and (V_2, ℓ_2) be $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -vector space and let $A : V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ be any nonzero $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -linear map. Then there exists some $y_* \in V_1 \setminus \{0\}$ such that, for all $y \in V_1 \setminus \{0\}$,*

$$(33) \quad \ell_2(Ay_*) - \ell_1(y_*) \geq \ell_2(Ay) - \ell_1(y).$$

⁵This lemma is exactly the same as Lemma 3.5 in the early version of [UZ15]. For submitted version, this lemma has been deleted for brevity. For reader's convenience, we add/repeat it here.

Proof. Because $\ker A$ is a subspace of V_1 , by Corollary 2.17 and 2.18 in [UZ15], there exists an orthogonal basis of V_1 , say $(v_1, \dots, v_r, v_{r+1}, \dots, v_n)$ such that $(v_{r+1}, \dots, v_n)$ is an orthogonal basis for $\ker A$ where $r = \text{rank}(A)$. Meanwhile, let $(w_1, \dots, w_m)$ be an orthogonal basis for V_2 . Represent A by an $m \times n$ matrix $\{A_{ij}\}$ over $\Lambda^{\mathcal{X}, \Gamma}$ with respect to these two bases, so that $Av_j = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} A_{ij} w_i$ for each $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. For any $y = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \lambda_j v_j$ in V , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_2(Ay) &= \ell_2 \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} A_{ij} \lambda_j \right) w_i \right) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} \left(\ell_2(w_i) - v \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} A_{ij} \lambda_j \right) \right) \\ &= \ell_2(w_{i(y)}) - v \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} A_{i(y)j} \lambda_j \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $i(y) \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ is the index attaining the maximum in the middle. By the definition of the valuation v ,

$$-v \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} A_{i(y)j} \lambda_j \right) \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left(-v(A_{i(y)j}) - v(\lambda_j) \right) = -v(A_{i(y)j(y)}) - v(\lambda_{j(y)})$$

where, again, $j(y) \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ is the index attaining the maximum in the middle. Also due to the orthogonality of $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$,

$$\ell_1(y) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} (\ell_1(v_j) - v(\lambda_j)) \geq \ell_1(v_{j(y)}) - v(\lambda_{j(y)}),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} (34) \quad \ell_2(Ay) - \ell_1(y) &\leq \left(\ell_2(w_{i(y)}) - v(A_{i(y)j(y)}) - v(\lambda_{j(y)}) \right) - \left(\ell_1(v_{j(y)}) - v(\lambda_{j(y)}) \right) \\ &= \ell_2(w_{i(y)}) - v(A_{i(y)j(y)}) - \ell_1(v_{j(y)}). \end{aligned}$$

Now choose (i_0, j_0) among $(i, j) \in \{1, \dots, m\} \times \{1, \dots, n\}$ so that

$$(35) \quad \ell_2(w_{i_0}) - v(A_{i_0 j_0}) - \ell_1(v_{j_0}) \geq \ell_2(w_i) - v(A_{ij}) - \ell_1(v_j)$$

for all i and j . Then due to the orthogonality of $(w_1, \dots, w_m)$, $\ell_2(Av_{j_0}) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\ell_2(w_i) - v(A_{ij_0}))$. So using (35), we have

$$\ell_2(Av_{j_0}) - \ell_1(v_{j_0}) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} (\ell_2(w_i) - v(A_{ij_0}) - \ell_1(v_{j_0})) = \ell_2(w_{i_0}) - v(A_{i_0 j_0}) - \ell_1(v_{j_0})$$


Given any $y \in C$, (35) holds for $i = i(y), j = j(y)$, so using (34) we get $\ell_2(Av_{j_0}) - \ell_1(v_{j_0}) \geq \ell_2(Ay) - \ell_1(y)$. Therefore $y_0 = v_{j_0}$ obeys the desired optimality property. $\square$

Roughly speaking The proof of the main theorem goes as follows. Step one: prove the conclusion in a special case that $C_T = C_S = 0$ in (22). Then it's easy to check

$$\mathcal{D}_{T'} = \mathcal{D}_T = \mathcal{D}_{R_p} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_{S'} = \mathcal{D}_S = \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}.$$

We call this *unperturbed case*. Step two: we will prove the conclusion in the general case, that is, *perturbed case*. We emphasize here that Step one will give a clear picture of the general algebraic strategy of the proof. The difference in the proofs between unperturbed case and perturbed case is mild. The majority of the algebraic construction can be adopted directly from Step one to Step two.

5.3. Unperturbed p -cyclic singular value decomposition. In this subsection, as mentioned above, we will work on the special case - unperturbed case. The idea is the following



First, by Example 5.10, there exists a $\mathscr{D}_{R_p}$ -invariant orthogonal complement of $\ker(\partial_{co})$ in $\text{Cone}_{k+1}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I})$, denoted as W . Let's start from (a). Since $\mathscr{D}_{R_p}$ is diagonalizable, its eigenvalues are $\{1, \xi_p, \dots, \xi_p^{p-1}\}$. Therefore, we have the following decompositions

$$(36) \quad \ker(\partial_{co}) = E_0 \oplus E_1 \oplus \dots \oplus E_{p-1}$$

and

$$(37) \quad W = F_0 \oplus F_1 \oplus \dots \oplus F_{p-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Im}(\partial_{co}) = G_0 \oplus G_1 \oplus \dots \oplus G_{p-1}$$

where E_i , F_i and G_i are eigenspaces of $\mathscr{D}_{R_p}$ of eigenvalue ξ_p^i in their corresponding (invariant) subspaces. Note that it is possible that some of them are trivial. Study the algebraic relation between different eigenspaces is crucial. From linear algebra, different E_i 's (so are F_i and G_i) are $\Lambda^{\mathscr{K}, \Gamma}$ -linearly independent over $\Lambda^{\mathscr{K}, \Gamma}$. Now we will show they are actually mutually orthogonal to each other. This is the following lemma.

Lemma 5.21. $\{E_i\}_{i=1}^{p-1}$ are mutually orthogonal to each other. So are $\{F_i\}_{i=1}^{p-1}$ and $\{G_i\}_{i=1}^{p-1}$.

Proof. Assume all the basis elements have filtration 0. $\mathscr{D}_{R_p}$ acting on E_i implies $[(\mathscr{D}_{R_p})] = \mathscr{D}_{R_p}$ acting on $[E_i]$. Moreover, by Example 5.13, eigenspace E_i (of eigenvalue ξ_p^i) reduces to $\mathscr{K}$ -space $[E_i]$ which is a subspace of eigenspace (of eigenvalue $[\xi_p^i] = \xi_p^i$) of $[\ker(\partial_{co})]$. Because different eigenspaces $[E_i]$ are $\mathscr{K}$ -linearly independent, by Lemma 5.11, E_i is $\Lambda^{\mathscr{K}, \Gamma}$ -orthogonal to E_j for all $i \neq j$. A similar argument holds for $\{F_i\}_{i=0}^{p-1}$ and $\{G_i\}_{i=0}^{p-1}$. $\square$

On the other hand, W is isomorphic to $\text{Im}(\partial_{co})$, so in particular,

$$(38) \quad \dim_{\Lambda^{\mathscr{K}, \Gamma}}(W) = \dim_{\Lambda^{\mathscr{K}, \Gamma}}(\text{Im}(\partial_{co})).$$

∂_{co} and $\mathscr{D}_{R_p}$ commutes gives rise to an important observation that ∂_{co} brings a $\mathscr{D}_{R_p}$ -invariant subspace into a $\mathscr{D}_{R_p}$ -invariant subspace. In particular, we have $\partial_{co}(F_i) \leq G_i$, so $\dim_{\Lambda^{\mathscr{K}, \Gamma}}(F_i) \leq \dim_{\Lambda^{\mathscr{K}, \Gamma}}(G_i)$. (38) implies the dimensions are actually equal for each i . So restrictions

$$\partial_{co}|_{F_i} : F_i \rightarrow G_i,$$

are isomorphisms between two (smaller) filtered $\Lambda^{\mathscr{K}, \Gamma}$ -vector spaces. Then

Proposition 5.22. *There exists a singular value decomposition of $\partial_{co} = (\partial_{co})_{k+1} : Cone_{k+1}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \rightarrow \text{Im}(\partial_{co})$ (compatible with action $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$ in the sense that they span eigenspaces of eigenvalues ξ_p^q for $0 \leq q \leq p-1$).*

Proof. Choose an orthogonal basis for each E_i . Together all $0 \leq i \leq p-1$, they will form an orthogonal basis for $\ker(\partial_{co})$ by Lemma 5.21. By Theorem 3.5 in [UZ15], there exists a singular value decomposition of each $\partial_{co}|_{F_i}$. Again together all $0 \leq i \leq p-1$, they will form a singular value decomposition of $\partial_{co}|_W$ again by Lemma 5.21. $\square$

Now for (b), we have $\mathcal{D}_S = \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}$ and therefore $\mathcal{D}_S$ acts on each eigenspace of $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$. By discussion above, we will work on E_i and $\partial_{co}|_{F_i} : F_i \rightarrow G_i$ piece by piece for each $1 \leq i \leq p-1$.

On E_i , for any $x \in E_i$, by Lemma 5.17, $\{x, \mathcal{D}_S x, \dots, \mathcal{D}_S^{p-1} x\}$ as a $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ -orthogonal set occupies a p -dimensional subspace of E_i . Choose (if $\dim(E_i) > p$) a $y \in E_i$ such that it is orthogonal to cyclic span V_x . By Lemma 5.18, V_y is $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ -orthogonal to V_x . So it occupies another p -dimensional subspace of E_i . Inductively going through this process, we find an orthogonal basis of E_i in the form of p -tuple,

$$(39) \quad (x, \mathcal{D}_S x, \dots, \mathcal{D}_S^{p-1} x, y, \mathcal{D}_S y, \dots, \mathcal{D}_S^{p-1} y \dots).$$

On $\partial_{co}|_{F_i} : F_i \rightarrow G_i$, we will formulate a theoretic process (in accordance with the algorithmic process, Theorem 3.5 in [UZ15] of finding a singular value decomposition) which is the following lemma. The idea of generating singular value decomposition is by orthogonally cutting down p -dimensional subspaces. In general, we have

Lemma 5.23. *For a filtered isomorphism $A : (V_1, \ell_1) \rightarrow (V_2, \ell_2)$ with group action by S such that $S^p = \xi_p^q \cdot \mathbb{I}$ for $1 \leq q \leq p-1$ (so S exactly preserves filtration), there exists a pair of dimension p subspaces in the cyclic span form of (V_y, V_x) where $A(V_y) = V_x$ such that there exists an orthogonal complement pair (W_1, W_2) in the sense that*

- (1) $A(W_1) = W_2$;
- (2) $V_1 = V_y \oplus W_1$ and W_1 is orthogonal to V_y ;
- (3) $V_2 = V_x \oplus W_2$ and W_2 is orthogonal to V_x .

Proof. By Lemma 5.20, there exists an optimal pair (x^*, y^*) where $A(y^*) = x^*$ such that for all $y \in V_1$,

$$(40) \quad \ell_1(y^*) - \ell_2(x^*) \leq \ell_1(y) - \ell_2(Ay).$$

Since S exactly preserve filtrations,

$$(41) \quad \ell_1(S^i y^*) - \ell_2(S^i x^*) \leq \ell_1(y) - \ell_2(Ay)$$

for all the $i = 0, \dots, p-1$. By Lemma 5.18 we know elements from $\{x^*, \dots, S^{p-1} x^*\}$ are orthogonal, so are elements from $\{y^*, \dots, S^{p-1} y^*\}$. So consider the span V_{x^*} and denote its orthogonal complement as W_2 and its preimage under A as $W_1 = A^{-1}(W_2)$. Now we only need to show proposition (2) above. We will show this inductively (with finitely many steps). By Lemma 2.15 in [UZ15],

$$W_1 \perp \langle y^* \rangle \text{ and } \langle S y^* \rangle \perp W_1 \oplus \langle y^* \rangle \Rightarrow W_1 \perp \langle y^*, S y^* \rangle.$$

Then

$$W_1 \perp \langle y^*, Sy^* \rangle \text{ and } \langle S^2 y^* \rangle \perp W_1 \oplus \langle y^*, Sy^* \rangle \Rightarrow W_1 \perp \langle y^*, Sy^*, S^2 y^* \rangle.$$

Inductively, we will get the conclusion.

Indeed, in order to prove $W_1 \perp \langle y^* \rangle$, which is equivalent to the statement that for any $v \in W_1$, $\ell_1(y^*) \leq \ell_1(y^* - v)$, we note since W_2 is orthogonal to $\langle x_* \rangle$, $\ell_2(A(y^* - v)) \geq \ell_2(x)$, so by optimal choice (40) we get the conclusion. Now let's prove $\langle Sy^* \rangle \perp W_1 \oplus \langle y^* \rangle$. Actually, the proof is similar. Again, this is equivalent to show for any $v \in W_1 \oplus \langle y^* \rangle$, $\ell_1(Sy^*) \leq \ell_1(Sy^* - v)$. Because $W_2 \oplus \langle x^* \rangle$ is orthogonal to $\langle Sx^* \rangle$, $\ell_2(A(Sy^* - v)) \geq \ell_2(Sx^*)$. Then by optimal choice (41), we get the conclusion. in general, the same argument works for the proof of $\langle S^{i+1} y^* \rangle \perp W_1 \oplus \langle y^*, \dots, S^i y^* \rangle$. $\square$

Remark 5.24. Note that the condition $S^p = \xi_p^q \cdot \mathbb{I}$ of Lemma 5.23 is only used to formulate a cyclic span V_{x^*} .

Inductively applying Lemma 5.23 to $\partial_{co} = \partial_{co}|_{F_i}$, $V_1 = F_i$ and $V_2 = G_i$, we get a singular value decomposition of $\partial_{co}|_{F_i}$ for each $1 \leq i \leq p-1$ in p -tuple. Together, we get a singular value decomposition of $\partial_{co}|_W$, that is

$$(42) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} y_1 & \mathcal{D}_S y_1 & \dots & \mathcal{D}_S^{p-1} y_1 & y_2 & \dots \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ x_1 & \mathcal{D}_S x_1 & \dots & \mathcal{D}_S^{p-1} x_1 & x_2 & \dots \end{array}$$

and this is the required p -tuple form. In summary, we get the following proposition.

Proposition 5.25. Assume $\mathcal{D}_S = \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}$. There exists a singular value decomposition in p -tuple form as (39) and (42) of

$$\partial_{co}|_{\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} E_i \oplus F_i} : \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} E_i \oplus F_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} G_i$$

which is compatible with action $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$ in the sense that cyclic spans generate each eigenspace.

Now, we deal with (c). By Remark 5.19, we will take a special consideration of eigenspace of eigenvalue 1. Denote $K_0 = E_0 \oplus F_0$ (eigenspace of eigenvalue 1 of $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$ in $\text{Cone}_{k+1}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I})$). We claim

Proposition 5.26. The restriction map $\partial_{co}|_{K_0} : K_0 \rightarrow G_0$ only contributes 0-length bars.

Proof. On the one hand, we know precisely the generators of K_0 . Indeed, for each generating loop (for rotation), say $x(t)$,⁶ denote $x(t)_{(i)} = x\left(t + \frac{i}{p^2}\right)$ where $0 \leq i \leq p^2 - 1$. Then

$$\text{Cone}_{k+1}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) = \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{X}, \Gamma}} \left\langle \begin{array}{l} (0, x_i(t)), \dots, (0, x_i(t)_{(p^2-1)}) \\ (y_j(t), 0), \dots, (y_j(t)_{(p^2-1)}, 0) \end{array} \right\rangle_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}},$$

⁶All these loops are normalized to be filtration 0 by adjusting cappings.

where $x_i(t)$'s have indices equal to $k+1$ and $y_j(t)$'s have indices equal to $k+2$. Moreover, these (initial) generators are $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -orthogonal. On the one hand, from the definition of $\mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}$, we know K_0 is generated by the element in the following form. Denote

$$(43) \quad v_i = x_i(t) + x_i(t)_p + \dots + x_i(t)_{p^2-p} \text{ and } w_j = y_j(t) + y_j(t)_p + \dots + y_j(t)_{p^2-p}.$$

Then,

$$(44) \quad K_0 = \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}} \left\langle \begin{array}{c} (0, v_i), (0, S v_i), \dots, (0, S^{p-1} v_i) \\ (w_j, 0), (S w_j, 0), \dots, (S^{p-1} w_j, 0) \end{array} \right\rangle_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}}.$$

Note that generators are all eigenvector of eigenvalue 1 of $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$ because $\mathcal{D}_S$ commutes with $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$ and more importantly, they are $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -orthogonal. On the other hand, by definition of ∂_{co} , for any eigenvector of eigenvalue 1 of $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$ in the form of $(0, z(t))$,

$$\partial_{co}((0, z(t))) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial & -(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \\ 0 & -\partial \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ z(t) \end{pmatrix} = ((\xi_p - 1)z(t), -\partial z(t)).$$

Applying this relation to $(0, S^h w_j)$ for $0 \leq h \leq p-1$, we get

$$\partial_{co}(0, S^h w_j) = ((\xi_p - 1)S^h w_j, -\partial S^h w_j).$$

By Lemma 5.6, since ∂ strictly decreases the filtration, orthogonality of $\{(S^h w_j, 0)\}_{h=0}^{p-1}$ is equivalent to orthogonality of $\{\partial_{co}(0, S^h w_j)\}_{h=0}^{p-1} = \{(\xi_p - 1)S^h w_j, -\partial S^h w_j\}_{h=0}^{p-1}$ which are also eigenvectors of eigenvalue 1 of $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$. Therefore, instead of (44), we can write

$$(45) \quad K_0 = \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}} \left\langle \begin{array}{c} (0, v_i), \dots, (0, S^{p-1} v_i) \\ \partial_{co}(0, w_j), \dots, \partial_{co}(0, S^{p-1} w_j) \end{array} \right\rangle_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}}.$$

So,

$$\text{Im}(\partial_{co}|_{K_0}) = \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}} \langle \partial_{co}(0, v_i), \dots, \partial_{co}(0, S^{p-1} v_i) \rangle_{1 \leq i \leq m}$$

because $(\partial_{co})^2 = 0$. Moreover $\{\partial_{co}(0, v_i), \dots, \partial_{co}(0, S^{p-1} v_i)\}$ are orthogonal by the same reason as above. In other words, for each degree $k+1$, we get p -tuple singular value decomposition of $\partial_{co}|_{K_0}$ with building block

$$\begin{array}{cccc} (0, v_i) & (0, S v_i) & \dots & (0, S^{p-1} v_i) \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \dots & \downarrow \\ \partial_{co}(0, v_i) & \partial_{co}(0, S v_i) & \dots & \partial_{co}(0, S^{p-1} v_i) \end{array}$$

(together with those mapped to 0 which are also in p -tuple). Moreover, these p -tuples only contribute 0-length bar because it's easy to check $\ell_{co}((0, v_i)) = \ell_{co}(\partial_{co}(0, v_i))$ for any v_i in (43). $\square$

Put all (a), (b) and (c) together, we confirm the unperturbed version of the main theorem.

5.4. Perturbed p -cyclic singular value decomposition. Now we are working with general $\mathcal{D}_T$ and $\mathcal{D}_S$. By Lemma 5.3, we can reduce to group actions $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{S'}$. Once we have group action, by Lemma 5.7 and Lemma 5.4, there exists an orthogonal $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ -invariant decomposition of the domain, denoted as $\ker(\partial_{co}) \oplus W$ where W is also $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ -invariant.

Next, we want to find the eigenvalue decomposition of $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$. Different from $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$, the exact values of eigenvalues are not obvious here. However, we have

Lemma 5.27. *For any eigenvalue λ of $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$,*

$$\lambda = \xi_p^i + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{strictly lower} \\ \text{filtration terms} \end{array} \right\}.$$

for some $i \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$.

Proof. This is a direct application of Lemma 5.15 because characteristic polynomial of $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ is in the form of $\lambda^p = 1 + g(\lambda)$ for some polynomial $g(x) \in \Lambda^{\mathcal{H}, \mathbb{R}_{>0}}[x]$ with degree at most $p-1$. In fact, λ^p is part of the summand of product of all the diagonal entries (so contains p -many λ) and 1 is part of the summand of product of (possibly perturbed) all the entries involving -1 . Other summand of product contains at most $(p-1)$ -many λ . $\square$

Now denote, for $0 \leq i \leq p-1$,

$$(46) \quad \Theta(i) = \left\{ \xi_p^i + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{strictly lower} \\ \text{filtration terms} \end{array} \right\} \right\}$$

where generic element in $\Theta(i)$ is denoted as $\theta(i)$. We remark here that different perturbations of strictly lower filtration terms will give rise to different eigenvalues. But for each $0 \leq i \leq p-1$,

$$\#\{\theta(i) \in \Theta(i)\} = \#\{\xi_p^i \in \text{eigenvalues of } \mathcal{D}_{R_p}\}.$$

where $\#\{\cdot\}$ means the algebraic multiplicity of the set $\{\cdot\}$. Moreover, perturbed operator $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ is not necessarily diagonalizable. However, similar to (36) and (37), we have

Lemma 5.28. *$\ker(\partial_{co})$, W and $\text{Im}(\partial_{co})$ can be orthogonally decomposed as*

$$(47) \quad \ker(\partial_{co}) = \tilde{E}_0 \oplus \tilde{E}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \tilde{E}_{p-1}$$

and

$$(48) \quad W = \tilde{F}_0 \oplus \tilde{F}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \tilde{F}_{p-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Im}(\partial_{co}) = \tilde{G}_0 \oplus \tilde{G}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \tilde{G}_{p-1}$$

where

$$\tilde{E}_i = \bigoplus_{\theta(i) \in \Theta(i)} E_{\theta(i)}, \quad \tilde{F}_i = \bigoplus_{\theta(i) \in \Theta(i)} F_{\theta(i)}, \quad \tilde{G}_i = \bigoplus_{\theta(i) \in \Theta(i)} G_{\theta(i)}$$

are direct sums of generalized eigenspaces $E_{\theta(i)}$, $F_{\theta(i)}$ and $G_{\theta(i)}$ of $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ of (perturbed) eigenvalue $\theta(i)$ respectively.

Proof. The decompositions come from a general fact in linear algebra that an operator can be decomposed as a direct sum of generalized eigenspaces as long as the working field contains the corresponding eigenvalues (and this is guaranteed by Lemma 5.15). The proof of orthogonality is exactly the same as Lemma 5.21 (because direct sum $\tilde{E}_i$, or $\tilde{F}_i$ and $\tilde{G}_i$, of generalized eigenspaces of (perturbed) eigenvalues $\theta(i)$'s reduces to $[\tilde{E}_i]$ as the eigenspace of $\mathcal{D}_{R_p}$ of eigenvalue ξ_p^i), together with Lemma 5.6. $\square$

By the same argument as above, we have isomorphisms $\partial_{co}|_{\tilde{F}_i} : \tilde{F}_i \simeq \tilde{G}_i$ as a direct sum of family of isomorphisms $\partial_{co}|_{F_{\theta(i)}} : F_{\theta(i)} \simeq G_{\theta(i)}$ for each $\theta(i) \in \Theta(i)$ for $0 \leq i \leq p-1$. Similar to Proposition 5.22,

Proposition 5.29. *There exists a singular value decomposition of $\partial_{co} : \text{Cone}_{k+1}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) \rightarrow \text{Im}(\partial_{co})$ (compatible with $\mathcal{D}_{T'}$ in the sense of that they span its generalized eigenspaces).*

Now assume $\mathcal{D}_{T'} = \mathcal{D}_{S'}^p$, then $\mathcal{D}_{S'}$ acts on each $\tilde{E}_i$, $\tilde{F}_i$ and $\tilde{G}_i$ because it acts on each $\tilde{E}_{\theta(i)}$, $\tilde{F}_{\theta(i)}$ and $\tilde{G}_{\theta(i)}$. Moreover, for instance on $\tilde{E}_i$, if $\Theta(i) = \{\theta(i)_1, \dots, \theta(i)_m\}$, then for any $x \in \tilde{E}_i$ with expression $x = x_1 + \dots + x_m$ where $x_j \in E_{\theta(i)_j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$,

(49)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{S'}^p x &= \mathcal{D}_{T'} x = \theta(i)_1 x_1 + \dots + \theta(i)_m x_m = \xi_p^i (x_1 + \dots + x_m) + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{strictly lower} \\ \text{filtration terms} \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \xi_p^i x + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{strictly lower} \\ \text{filtration terms} \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

In other words, for $x \in \tilde{E}_i$, $\text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle x, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} x \rangle$ is not an invariant subspace any more (due to the perturbed terms). However, still we have (perturbed version of Corollary 5.17),

Lemma 5.30. *For $1 \leq i \leq p-1$, if $x \in \tilde{E}_i$ (or $\tilde{F}_i$, $\tilde{G}_i$), then $\{x, \mathcal{D}_{S'} x, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} x\}$ are $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ -orthogonal.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.11, $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ -orthogonality of $\{x, \mathcal{D}_{S'} x, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} x\}$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{K}$ -linearly independent of $\{[x], [\mathcal{D}_{S'}][x], \dots, ([\mathcal{D}_{S'}])^{p-1}[x]\} = \{[x], \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}[x], \dots, \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}^{p-1}[x]\}$. Meanwhile, cyclic span $V_{[x]}$ (over $\mathcal{K}$) is $\mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}$ -invariant because (49) reduces to

$$\mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}^p [x] = \xi_p^i [x].$$

Hence, “irreducible condition” implies the desired $\mathcal{K}$ -linear independence. $\square$

Also similar to Corollary 5.18, we have

Lemma 5.31. *For $1 \leq i \leq p-1$, if for a given $y \in \tilde{E}_i$ (or $\tilde{F}_i$ and $\tilde{G}_i$), it is $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ -orthogonal to $\text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle x, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} x \rangle$, then*

$$\text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle y, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} y \rangle \text{ is } \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}\text{-orthogonal to } \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle x, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} x \rangle.$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.11, we only need to consider the set

$$\{[x], \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}[x], \dots, \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}^{p-1}[x], [y], \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}[y], \dots, \mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}^{p-1}[y]\}.$$

These span a $\mathcal{D}_{R_{p^2}}$ -invariant subspace. Then the argument of Corollary 5.18 (with “irreducible condition”) implies the $\mathcal{K}$ -linearly independence. $\square$

Then we have a perturbed version of Proposition 5.25,

Proposition 5.32. *Assume $\mathcal{D}_{S'}$ exists. There exists a singular value decomposition in p -tuple form as (39) and (42) of*

$$\partial_{co}|_{\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} \tilde{E}_i \oplus \tilde{F}_i} : \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} \tilde{E}_i \oplus \tilde{F}_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq p-1} \tilde{G}_i.$$

Proof. For each $\tilde{E}_i$, for any $x \in \tilde{E}_i$, we get a p -dimensional subspace $\text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle x, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1}x \rangle$ by Lemma 5.30. Choose $y \in \tilde{E}_i$ such that y is $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ -orthogonal to $\text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle x, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1}x \rangle$. By Lemma 5.31, we get another p -dimensional subspace. Inductively apply this process until we run out of the dimension of $\tilde{E}_i$. Thus together for all $1 \leq i \leq p-1$, we get a basis of $\ker(\partial_{co})$ as in (39), that is,

$$(50) \quad \{x, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^2 x, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} x, y, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^2 y, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} y, \dots\}.$$

Now we will deal with $\partial_{co}|_{\tilde{F}_i} : \tilde{F}_i \rightarrow \tilde{G}_i$. By Remark 5.24, we can apply Lemma 5.23 to $\partial_{co}|_{\tilde{F}_i}$, $V_1 = \tilde{F}_i$ and $V_2 = \tilde{G}_i$. The only difference is replacing cyclic span V_{x^*} by (non-invariant) subspace $\text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle x^*, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} x^* \rangle$. Thus we get a correspondence as in (42), that is,

$$(51) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} y_1 & \mathcal{D}_{S'} y_1 & \dots & \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} y_1 & y_2 & \dots \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ x_1 & \mathcal{D}_{S'} x_1 & \dots & \mathcal{D}_{S'}^{p-1} x_1 & x_2 & \dots \end{array}$$

Together we get the desired singular value decomposition in p -tuple. $\square$

Remark 5.33. We want to emphasize here that if we apply Lemma 5.23 to $\partial_{co}|_{F_{\theta(i)}} : F_{\theta(i)} \rightarrow G_{\theta(i)}$, then is it not quite clear the singular value decomposition for this restriction is orthogonal or not to a singular value decomposition of another restriction $\partial_{co}|_{F_{\theta'(i)}}$ of another perturbed eigenvalue $\theta'(i)$ because the reduced $\mathcal{K}$ -space of both $F_{\theta(i)}$ and $F_{\theta'(i)}$ are subspaces of eigenspace space of the same eigenvalue ξ_p^i , so Lemma 5.28 does not apply directly. Similar situation for $\tilde{E}_i$. In other words, each basis element of singular value decomposition for $\partial_{co}|_{\tilde{F}_i} : \tilde{F}_i \rightarrow \tilde{G}_i$ is, in general, a $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$ -linear combination of elements from $F_{\theta(i)}$ and $G_{\theta(i)}$.

Last but not least, denote $\tilde{K}_0 = \tilde{E}_0 \oplus \tilde{F}_0$, we have a similar result as Proposition 5.26.

Proposition 5.34. *The restriction map $\partial_{co}|_{\tilde{K}_0} : \tilde{K}_0 \rightarrow \tilde{G}_0$ only contributes (in p -tuple) 0-length bars.*

Proof. Similar to proof of Proposition 5.26, it's easy to show

$$(52) \quad \tilde{K}_0 = \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \left\langle \begin{array}{c} (0, \tilde{v}_i), (0, S' \tilde{v}_i), \dots, (0, (S')^{p-1} \tilde{v}_i) \\ (\tilde{w}_j, 0), (S' \tilde{w}_j, 0), \dots, ((S')^{p-1} \tilde{w}_j, 0) \end{array} \right\rangle_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}},$$

where $\tilde{v}_i$ and $\tilde{w}_j$ are strictly lower filtration perturbations of v_i and w_j as defined in (43). More important, these elements are pairwise orthogonal. For $\tilde{w}_j$, on the one hand,

$$T \tilde{w}_j = (T' - P_T^{(3)}) \tilde{w}_j = \tilde{w}_j + \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{strictly lower} \\ \text{filtration terms} \end{array} \right\}.$$

On the other hand, since $[S', T] = 0$,

$$\partial_{co}(0, (S')^h \tilde{w}_j) = \left((\xi_p - 1)(S')^h \tilde{w}_j + \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{strictly lower} \\ \text{filtration terms} \end{array} \right\}, -\partial(S')^h \tilde{w}_j \right).$$

By Lemma 5.6, orthogonality of $\{(S')^h \tilde{w}_j, 0\}_{h=0}^{p-1}$ implies orthogonality of $\{\partial_{co}(0, (S')^h \tilde{w}_j)\}_{h=0}^{p-1}$. Meanwhile, we can rewrite

$$\tilde{K}_0 = \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \left\langle \begin{array}{c} (0, \tilde{v}_i), (0, S' \tilde{v}_i), \dots, (0, (S')^{p-1} \tilde{v}_i) \\ \partial_{co}(0, \tilde{w}_j), \partial_{co}(0, S' \tilde{w}_j), \dots, \partial_{co}(0, (S')^{p-1} \tilde{w}_j) \end{array} \right\rangle_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq n}}.$$

Therefore, we have the correspondence as in (5.3),

$$\begin{array}{cccc} (0, \tilde{v}_i) & (0, S' \tilde{v}_i) & \dots & (0, (S')^{p-1} \tilde{v}_i) \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \dots & \downarrow \\ \partial_{co}(0, \tilde{v}_i) & \partial_{co}(0, S' \tilde{v}_i) & \dots & \partial_{co}(0, (S')^{p-1} \tilde{v}_i) \end{array}$$

It's easy to check $\ell_{co}((0, \tilde{v}_i)) = \ell_{co}(\partial_{co}(0, \tilde{v}_i))$ for any perturbed $\tilde{v}_i$, so these only contribute 0-length bars. $\square$

5.5. Proof of Theorem 1.18.

Proof. Proposition 5.32 and Proposition 5.34. $\square$

6. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.20

Proof. Because the action $\mathcal{D}_{S'}$ given by Proposition 1.17, with Corollary 5.4, satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 1.18 on $\text{Cone}(H)_*$ where Hamiltonian H generates $\phi = \phi_H \in \text{Power}_p(X)$, the first conclusion directly comes from the Proposition 1.18 and definition of $\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)$ in Definition 1.19. For the second conclusion, suppose $s_{\max}$ is the largest multiple of p smaller than m_k , the multiplicity of degree- k concise barcode of $\text{Cone}(H)_*$. Then $p \nmid m_k$ implies $\beta_{s_{\max}p+1}(C) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{(s_{\max}+1)p}(C) = 0$. Therefore,

$$\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)_k \geq \beta_{s_{\max}p+1}(\phi) - \beta_{(s_{\max}+1)p}(\phi) = \beta_{s_{\max}p+1}(\phi) \geq \beta_{m_k}(\phi).$$

By its definition again, $\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi) \geq \mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)_k \geq \beta_{m_k}(\phi)$. $\square$

7. LIPSCHITZ CONTINUITY

In this section, we will prove all three Lipschitz continuity results mentioned in the introduction.

7.1. Algebraic set-up.

Definition 7.1. For a $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -linear map $F : (V, \ell_1) \rightarrow (W, \ell_2)$ between two orthogonalizable $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K},\Gamma}$ -space, F is called a δ -morphism if there exists a $\delta \geq 0$ such that for any $v \in V$,

$$\ell_2(Fv) \leq \ell_1(v) + \delta.$$

In particular a filtration preserving map is a 0-morphism.

Note that by definition, a δ -morphism is automatically a η -morphism for any $\delta \leq \eta$.

Definition 7.2. Given two filtered chain complexes $(C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C)$ and $(D_*, \partial_D, \ell_D)$, suppose chain map $\Phi : C_* \rightarrow D_*$ is a δ_+ -morphism and $\Psi : C_* \rightarrow D_*$ is a δ_- -morphism. Then we say that Φ and Ψ are (δ_+, δ_-) -homotopic if there exists a degree-1 (δ_+, δ_-) -morphism $K : C_* \rightarrow D_{*+1}$ such that


$$\Phi - \Psi = K \circ \partial_C + \partial_D \circ K.$$

where then K is called a (δ_+, δ_-) -homotopy.

Example 7.3. Using Definition 7.2, definition of (δ_-, δ_+) -quasiequivalence between $(C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C)$ and $(D_*, \partial_D, \ell_D)$ (defined in Definition 1.12) can be rephrased as

- there exist a δ_+ -morphism $\Phi : C_* \rightarrow D_*$ and a δ_- -morphism $\Psi : D_* \rightarrow C_*$;
- $\Psi \circ \Phi$ and $\mathbb{I}_{C_*}$ are (δ_+, δ_-) -homotopic and $\Phi \circ \Psi$ and $\mathbb{I}_{D_*}$ are (δ_+, δ_-) -homotopic.

Now consider the following algebraic set-up. For two filtered chain complexes $(C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C)$ (simply denoted as C) and $(D_*, \partial_D, \ell_D)$ (simply denoted as D), we will study the following diagram



where

- S and S' 0-morphism chain maps;
- ϕ and ψ are (δ_+, δ_-) -quasiequivalent with homotopies K_C and K_D ;
- $S' \circ \phi$ and $\phi \circ S$ are (δ_+, δ_-) -homotopic with homotopy P ;
- $S \circ \psi$ and $\psi \circ S'$ are (δ_+, δ_-) -homotopic with homotopy Q .

Here we give a supporting example from our story to this algebraic set-up.

Example 7.4. When we are considering the chain complexes with (almost) rotation actions constructed from different Hamiltonians H and G , that is, the following diagram for

some continuation maps C_H , C_G and $C_{H,G}$,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{R_p} & CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p}})_\alpha & \xrightarrow{C_H} & CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \\
 \downarrow C_{H,G} & & \downarrow (R_p)_*(C_{H,G}) & & \downarrow C_{H,G} \\
 CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{R_p} & CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_{t+\frac{1}{p}})_\alpha & \xrightarrow{C_G} & CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha
 \end{array}$$

the second (right) diagram above is not necessarily commutative (where continuation map commutes with boundary operator but not necessarily commutes with other continuation maps), so the following collapsed diagram is then not necessarily a commutative diagram,

$$(53) \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
 CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{T^H} & CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \\
 \downarrow C_{H,G} & & \downarrow C_{H,G} \\
 CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{T^G} & CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha
 \end{array}$$

where $T^H = C_H \circ R_p$ and $T^G = C_G \circ R_p$. Meanwhile, we can symmetrically form continuation map $C_{G,H} : CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \rightarrow CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha$. Likewise, we have a (not necessarily commutative) diagram,

$$(54) \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
 CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{T^G} & CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \\
 \downarrow C_{G,H} & & \downarrow C_{G,H} \\
 CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{T^H} & CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha.
 \end{array}$$

However, we can prove these two diagrams are not far from being commutative. In fact,

Lemma 7.5. *The diagram (53) is commutative up to a filtration shifting homotopy with filtration shifted up to $p||H - G||_H$. More precisely, $T^G \circ C_{H,G}$ and $C_{H,G} \circ T^H$ are $(p \int_0^1 \max_X (H - G) dt, p \int_0^1 -\min_X (H - G) dt)$ -homotopic with homotopy P . The same conclusion holds for diagram (54) with a homotopy Q .*

Proof. By Floer gluing argument, we can glue the homotopy inducing T^G and the homotopy between $(H^{(p)}, J)$ and $(G^{(p)}, J)$ so that it gives a new chain map between $CF_*(H^{(p)}, J)_\alpha$ and $CF_*(G^{(p)}, J)_\alpha$. Similarly, for $C_{H,G} \circ T^H$, we get another chain map. By Remark 2.2 in Section 2, two induced chain maps (from different homotopies) are homotopic to each other with certain filtration shifts. Moreover, the filtration shifts are given by the standard energy estimations and the definitions of $H^{(p)}$ and $G^{(p)}$. $\square$

Therefore, (53), (54), Lemma 7.5 and Theorem 2.4 together gives rise to the following diagram compatible with the algebraic set-up above.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{T^H} & CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \\
 \downarrow C_{H,G} & \searrow P & \downarrow C_{H,G} \\
 K_H \curvearrowright CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{T^G} & CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \curvearrowright K_H \\
 \downarrow C_{G,H} & \searrow Q & \downarrow C_{G,H} \\
 K_G \curvearrowright CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{T^H} & CF_k(H^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha \curvearrowright K_G \\
 \downarrow C_{H,G} & \searrow P & \downarrow C_{H,G} \\
 CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha & \xrightarrow{T^G} & CF_k(G^{(p)}, J_t)_\alpha
 \end{array}$$

Now we remark that Proposition 1.21 can be easily proved if we can prove the following general algebraic proposition.

Proposition 7.6. *With the algebraic set-up above, there exist finite constants Δ_+ and Δ_- such that self-mapping cones of complex C and complex D with respect to map S and S' respectively, $\text{Cone}_C(S)$ and $\text{Cone}_D(S')$, are (Δ_+, Δ_-) -quasiequivalent. Moreover, $\Delta_+ + \Delta_- \leq 6(\delta_+ + \delta_-)$.*

In other words, by Example 7.3, we are looking for Δ_+ -morphism and Δ_- -morphism with (Δ_+, Δ_-) -homotopies. Assuming Proposition 7.6, we have

Proof of Proposition 1.21. Denote

$$\delta_+ = p \int_0^1 \max_X (H - G) dt \quad \text{and} \quad \delta_- = p \int_0^1 -\min_X (H - G) dt.$$

Let $S = T^H - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}$ and $S' = T^G - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}$. First, they are 0-morphisms because T^H and T^G preserves filtration. Moreover, they are chain maps because T^H and T^G commutes with boundary operator ∂ . Second, $C_{G,H} \circ C_{H,G}$ are (δ_+, δ_-) -quasiequivalent by Theorem 2.4. Third, $S' \circ C_{H,G}$ and $C_{H,G} \circ S$ are (δ_+, δ_-) -homotopic by Lemma 7.5. Therefore, all the conditions in the algebraic set-up are satisfied. By Proposition 7.6, there exists a (Δ_+, Δ_-) -quasiequivalence between $\text{Cone}(H)_*$ and $\text{Cone}(G)_*$. So we have

$$d_Q(\text{Cone}(H)_*, \text{Cone}(G)_*) \leq \frac{\Delta_+ + \Delta_-}{2} \leq 3(\delta_+ + \delta_-) = 3p \cdot \|H - G\|_H.$$

Thus we get the conclusion. □

For the rest of this section, we will focus on the proof of Proposition 7.6.

7.2. Homotopy category.

Definition 7.7. Considering the following category, denoted as $\mathcal{F}$:⁷

- Object in $\mathcal{F}$: filtered chain complex $(C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C)$;
- Morphism in $\mathcal{F}$: 0-morphism chain map.

Note that by this definition, any δ -morphism ϕ with $\delta > 0$ is *not* a morphism in $\mathcal{F}$. On the other hand, fixing this constant $\delta \geq 0$, we can define a map on $\mathcal{F}$ itself, denoted as Σ^δ by

- $\Sigma^\delta((C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C)) = (C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C + \delta)$;
- $\Sigma^\delta(\phi) = \phi$.

It is easy to see this map is a functor. This functor does not change morphism and shift up the filtration of any filtered chain complex by δ . In short notation, $\Sigma^\delta C := \Sigma^\delta((C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C))$ and

$$\ell_{\Sigma^\delta C} = \ell_C + \delta.$$

Therefore, for any δ -morphism $\phi : C \rightarrow D$, we know

$$\Sigma^\delta C \xrightarrow{\phi} D$$

is a well-defined morphism in $\mathcal{F}$ because $\ell_D(\phi(x)) \leq \ell_C(x) + \delta = \ell_{\Sigma^\delta C}(x)$ for any $x \in C$.

Example 7.8. Suppose C and D are (δ_+, δ_-) -quasiequivalent with chain maps ϕ and ψ . By discussion above, we have well-defined maps in $\mathcal{F}$,

$$\Sigma^{\delta_+ + \delta_-} C \xrightarrow{\phi} \Sigma^{\delta_-} D \xrightarrow{\psi} C \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma^{\delta_+ + \delta_-} D \xrightarrow{\phi} \Sigma^{\delta_+} C \xrightarrow{\psi} D.$$

Meanwhile, there is an obvious map $i_{\delta_- + \delta_+} : \Sigma^{\delta_+ + \delta_-} C \rightarrow C$ by identity map on C as a vector space. We emphasize that in the category $\mathcal{F}$,

$$\Sigma^{\delta_+ + \delta_-} C \neq C,$$

because their filtrations are different. Therefore, $i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}$ is not an identity map. Moreover, by definition of (δ_+, δ_-) -quasiequivalence, we know

$$\psi \circ \phi \text{ is filtered homotopic to } i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-} \text{ in } \mathcal{F}$$

and

$$\phi \circ \psi \text{ is filtered homotopic to } i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-} \text{ in } \mathcal{F}.$$

Now consider the following “smaller” category defined as

Definition 7.9. Define (filtered) homotopy category of filtered chain complex $K(\mathcal{F})$ as

- Object in $K(\mathcal{F})$: the same as object in $\mathcal{F}$;
- Morphism in $K(\mathcal{F})$: filtered homotopy class (in $\mathcal{F}$).

Example 7.10. The condition that C and D are (δ_+, δ_-) -quasiequivalent with chain maps ϕ and ψ is equivalent to the condition $\psi \circ \phi = \phi \circ \psi = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}$ in $K(\mathcal{F})$.

⁷It is routine to check that $\mathcal{F}$ is an additive category.

Using this language, we transfer the problem of constructing certain chain maps which are (desired) bounded filtration shifting homotopies into an existence question of morphisms in $K(\mathcal{F})$ up to a finite filtration shift. Therefore, we can restate Proposition 7.6 in this new category as

Proposition 7.11. *Suppose we have the algebraic set-up above. There exist finite positive constants Δ_+ and Δ_- such that there exist morphism Φ and Ψ in $\mathcal{F}$ to form the following sequence of maps,*

$$\Sigma^{\Delta_++\Delta_-} \text{Cone}_D(S') \xrightarrow{\Psi} \Sigma^{\Delta_+} \text{Cone}_C(S) \xrightarrow{\Phi} \text{Cone}_D(S') \xrightarrow{\Psi} \Sigma^{-\Delta_-} \text{Cone}_C(S)$$

and

$$\Phi \circ \Psi = \Psi \circ \Phi = i_{\Delta_++\Delta_-} \text{ in } K(\mathcal{F}).$$

Moreover, $\Delta_+ + \Delta_- = 6(\delta_+ + \delta_-)$.

First, we note $K(\mathcal{F})$ is a triangulated category, therefore, for the following diagram in $K(\mathcal{F})$,

$$(55) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} C & \xrightarrow{S} & C & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \text{Cone}_C(S) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & C[1] \\ \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow \phi[1] \\ D & \xrightarrow{S'} & D & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \text{Cone}_D(S') & \xrightarrow{\pi} & D[1] \end{array}$$

where ι is inclusion and π is projection. By 4. Corollary in [GM, p. 242], we know if the first ϕ , the second ϕ and the fourth $\phi[1]$ are isomorphisms, then the middle morphism h is also an isomorphism (existence of this map is given by axiom one (TR1) of triangulated category). The basic tool to prove this is the exactness of functor $\text{Hom}(\text{Cone}_D(S'), -)$ and $\text{Hom}(-, \text{Cone}_C(S))$ together with Five Lemma. Second, here our situation is ϕ and ψ is not necessarily invertible (because $i_{\delta_++\delta_-}$ is not identity). But we still can prove the following technical proposition saying h is “close to be invertible” in $K(\mathcal{F})$ modulo enough shift of filtration, which will directly imply proposition 7.6.

Proposition 7.12. *Apply exact functor $\text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_++\delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), -)$ to the diagram (55) shifted by Σ^{δ_+} on the first row. For $i_{\delta_++\delta_-}^3 \in \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_++\delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \text{Cone}_D(S'))$, there exists a j in $\text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_++\delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \Sigma^{\delta_+} \text{Cone}_C(S))$ such that $h \circ j = i_{\delta_++\delta_-}^3$.*

Remark 7.13. Note that filtration of $\text{Cone}_D(S')$ is just ℓ_D since S' preserves filtration. If $f : C \rightarrow D$ is well-defined in $K(\mathcal{F})$ then f is also well-defined from $\Sigma^{\delta} C \rightarrow D$ for any $\delta \geq 0$. Moreover, for any chain map f and any i_{δ} , we know

$$(56) \quad f \circ i_{\delta} = i_{\delta} \circ f.$$

Proof. We will closely follow the proof of Five Lemma. Starting from $i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 = i_{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \in \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \text{Cone}_D(S'))$, due to the following diagram,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \Sigma^{\delta_+} \text{Cone}_C(S)) & \xrightarrow{\pi \circ} & \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_C(S'), \Sigma^{\delta_+} C) \\ \downarrow h \circ & & \downarrow \phi \circ \\ \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \text{Cone}_D(S')) & \xrightarrow{\pi \circ} & \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), D) \end{array}$$

and (56) with Example 7.10, we know

$$\pi \circ i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 \circ \pi = \phi(i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 \circ \psi \circ \pi).$$

Therefore, there exists an element, say, $i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 \circ \psi \circ \pi \in \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \Sigma^{\delta_+} C)$ with image under ϕ to be $\pi \circ i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3$. Then composed with S' , we have

$$S' \circ \pi \circ i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 (i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 \circ S \circ \pi) = 0$$

so

$$(57) \quad i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 \circ S \circ \pi = 0.$$

Therefore, combining with (57) and relation $\psi \circ S' = S \circ \psi$,

$$S(i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 \circ \psi \circ \pi) = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 (S \circ \psi \circ \pi) = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 (\psi \circ S' \circ \pi) = \psi(i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 \circ S \circ \pi) = 0.$$

Since the top row is exact, there exists some $z \in \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \Sigma^{\delta_+} C)$ such that $\pi \circ z = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 \circ \psi \circ \pi$, so by (56) we can choose z to be in the form

$$z = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-} \circ z'$$

where $z' \in \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \Sigma^{2\delta_+ + \delta_-} C)$ (such that $\pi \circ z = \psi \circ \pi$). Next, considering the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \Sigma^{\delta_+} C) & \xrightarrow{\iota \circ} & \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \Sigma^{\delta_+} \text{Cone}_C(S)) \\ \downarrow \phi \circ & & \downarrow h \circ \\ \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), D) & \xrightarrow{\iota \circ} & \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \text{Cone}_D(S')) \end{array}$$

and element

$$i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 - h(z) = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 (i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 - h(z')).$$

By commutativity of previous diagram, we know this element is $\ker(\pi \circ)$. In fact,

$$\pi \circ i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 - \pi \circ h(z) = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 \pi - \phi(i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 \circ \psi \circ \pi) = 0.$$

So by exactness of lower row, we know there exists some $u \in \text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), D)$ such that $\iota(u) = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 (i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 - h(z')) = \phi(\psi(i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 - h(z')))$. Then we can take a preimage (under ϕ)

$$w = \psi(i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 - h(z'))$$

in $\text{Hom}(\Sigma^{3(\delta_+ + \delta_-)} \text{Cone}_D(S'), \Sigma^{\delta_+} C)$. Therefore

$$\iota(u) = \iota \circ \phi(w) = h \circ \iota(w) = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 - h(z)$$

so

$$i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 = h(z + \iota(w)).$$

Hence we have shown that there exists a preimage of $i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3$ under map h , that is

$$j := z + \iota(\psi(i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^2 - h(z'))).$$

Therefore, we find a j such that $h \circ j = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 7.11. Similarly to the proof of Proposition 7.12, we can apply contravariant functor $\text{Hom}(-, \Sigma^{-2\delta_+ - 3\delta_-} \text{Cone}_C(S))$ on the first row of diagram (55) shifted by functor Σ^{δ_+} so we will get some $j' \in \text{Hom}(\text{Cone}_D(S'), \Sigma^{-2\delta_+ - 3\delta_-} \text{Cone}_C(S))$ such that

$$(58) \quad j' \circ h = i_{\delta_+ - \delta_-}^3.$$

Combined with Proposition 7.12, we have the following composition,

$$(59) \quad \Sigma^{3\delta_+ + 3\delta_-} \text{Cone}_D(S') \xrightarrow{j} \Sigma^{\delta_+} \text{Cone}_C(S) \xrightarrow{h} \text{Cone}_D(S') \xrightarrow{j'} \Sigma^{-2\delta_+ - 3\delta_-} \text{Cone}_C(S).$$

Now j and j' are not necessarily the same since $i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3$ is not an isomorphism. But taking advantage that $i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3$ commutes with any morphism, we have

$$(j' \circ h \circ j) \circ h = j' \circ (h \circ j) \circ h = j' \circ i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 \circ h = (j' \circ h) \circ i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^6$$

and

$$h \circ (j' \circ h \circ j) = h \circ (j' \circ h) \circ j = h \circ i_{\delta_+ - \delta_-}^3 \circ j = (h \circ j) \circ i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^3 = i_{\delta_+ + \delta_-}^6.$$

Denote $g = j' \circ h \circ j$, then we can improve chain of maps (59) into

$$(60) \quad \Sigma^{6\delta_+ + 6\delta_-} \text{Cone}_D(S') \xrightarrow{g} \Sigma^{\delta_+} \text{Cone}_C(S) \xrightarrow{h} \text{Cone}_D(S') \xrightarrow{g} \Sigma^{-5\delta_+ - 6\delta_-} \text{Cone}_C(S).$$

Hence, we will get the conclusion by setting $\Delta_+ = \delta_+$, $\Delta_- = 5\delta_+ + 6\delta_-$ and $\Phi = h$ and $\Psi = g$. $\square$

7.3. Proofs of Proposition 1.22 and Proposition 1.23.

Proof of Proposition 1.22. By definition, (Δ_+, Δ_-) -quasiequivalence is in particular a $(\Delta_+ + \Delta_-, \Delta_+ + \Delta_-)$ -quasiequivalence. For any given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a (Δ_+, Δ_-) -quasiequivalence between $\text{Cone}(H)_*$ and $\text{Cone}(G)_*$ with

$$\Delta_+ + \Delta_- \leq 2d_Q(\text{Cone}(H)_*, \text{Cone}(G)_*) + 2\epsilon$$

Moreover, by Corollary 8.8 in [UZ15], we know

$$|\beta_i(\phi_H) - \beta_i(\phi_G)| \leq 2(\Delta_+ + \Delta_-) \leq 4d_Q(\text{Cone}(H)_*, \text{Cone}(G)_*) + 4\epsilon.$$

As ϵ is arbitrarily chosen, we get the conclusion. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 1.23. Clearly, we only need to prove the following conclusion

$$(61) \quad \mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)_k - \mathfrak{o}_X(\psi)_k \leq 24p \cdot d_H(\phi, \psi)$$

for each degree k . Indeed, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi) \leq \mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)_k + \epsilon$. Meanwhile, for this k , we have $\mathfrak{o}_X(\psi)_k \leq \mathfrak{o}_X(\psi)$. Therefore, (61) will implies

$$\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi) - \mathfrak{o}_X(\psi) \leq \mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)_k - \mathfrak{o}_X(\psi)_k + \epsilon \leq 24p \cdot d_H(\phi, \psi)$$

and by symmetry, we get the other direction.

Now suppose $\phi = \phi_H$ and $\psi = \psi_G$. Proposition 1.21 and Proposition 1.22 give

$$|\beta_i(\phi) - \beta_i(\psi)| \leq 12p \cdot \|H - G\|_H.$$

If $\mathfrak{o}_X(\phi)_k$ is realized by some index $s_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{o}_k(\phi) - \mathfrak{o}_k(\psi) &\leq (\beta_{s_0p+1}(\phi) - \beta_{(s_0+1)p}(\phi)) - (\beta_{s_0p+1}(\psi) - \beta_{(s_0+1)p}(\psi)) \\ &\leq (\beta_{s_0p+1}(\phi) - \beta_{s_0p+1}(\psi)) + (\beta_{(s_0+1)p}(\psi) - \beta_{(s_0+1)p}(\phi)) \leq 24p \cdot \|H - G\|_H. \end{aligned}$$

So we get the conclusion by taking the infimum over generating functions of ϕ and ψ . $\square$

8. COMPUTATION OF EGG-BEATER MODEL Σ_g

First, we will state CZ-index formula for generator of $CF_*(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha$ to help us label the indices later in this section. Recall from construction of egg-beater model, for each fixed point z , it will naturally come up with another $2p-1$ intermediate points, denoted as $z_1, \dots, z_{2p-1}$ and set $z = z_0$. Using coordinates, we denote

$$z_{2j} = (x_{2j}, y_{2j}) \quad \text{and} \quad z_{2j+1} = (x_{2j+1}, y_{2j+1}).$$

By (41) in [PS14], we know

$$(x_{2j+1}, y_{2j+1}) = (-y_{2j+2}, x_{2j}) \quad \text{and} \quad (x_{2p}, y_{2p}) = (x_0, y_0).$$

So we will expect our formula only involves x and y coordinate of *even* index intermediate points. Here it is,

Theorem 8.1. [Theorem 5.2 in [AKKKPRRSSZ16]] *In egg-beater model (12), the CZ-index of fixed point z with intermediate points $z_1, \dots, z_{2p-1}$ is given by*

$$(62) \quad \mu_{CZ}(z) = 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} (\text{sign}(x_{2j}) - \text{sign}(y_{2j})).$$

Note that each summand $\text{sign}(x_{2j}) - \text{sign}(y_{2j})$ only takes value $-2, 0$ and 2 , so support of index is $[-p+1, p+1]$. Moreover, we know

Corollary 8.2. *For each degree $k \in [-p+1, p+1]$, there are $\binom{2p}{k+p-1}$ -many fixed points z coming in with their p -tuple (13). Moreover, action of each generator of degree $k+1$ is strictly bigger than any generator of degree k with action gap proportion to λ up to a constant.*

Proof. For the first conclusion, suppose, within all the possible choices for $\text{sign}(x_{2j})$ and $-\text{sign}(y_{2j})$, we have a -many 1 and b -many -1 , then by (62), we know $a - b = 2(k-1)$. Meanwhile, $a + b = 2p$, therefore, we need to choose $a = k+p-1$ -many 1 's. The second conclusion comes from Proposition 5.1 in [PS14] with (62). $\square$

Now we will consider self-mapping cone of egg-beater model, denoted as

$$\text{Cone}_{\Sigma_g}(H_\lambda)_* := \text{Cone}_{CF(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha}(T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I})_*.$$

First, by a standard result from Floer theory, see Theorem 2.5, $H_*(CF(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha) = 0$ because α is non-contractible, so

$$(63) \quad H_*(Cone_{\Sigma_g}(H_\lambda)) = 0$$

by the following long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} \dots \rightarrow H_k(CF(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha) &\xrightarrow{((T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I})_k)_*} H_k(CF(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha) \\ &\xrightarrow{\iota_*} H_k(Cone_{\Sigma_g}(H_\lambda)) \xrightarrow{p_*} H_{k-1}(CF(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha) \rightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

where ι is inclusion and p is projection. Therefore, in terms of barcode, there are only finite length bars, possibly with zero length. Meanwhile, by rank-nullity theorem, it is easy to check

$$(64) \quad \dim(\ker(\partial_{co})_k) = \dim(\text{Im}(\partial_{co})_{k+1}) = \dim(CF_k(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha) = p \cdot \binom{2p}{k+p-1}.$$

Therefore, total multiplicity of verbose barcode of $Cone_{\Sigma_g}(H_\lambda)_*$ is

$$\sum_k \dim \ker(\partial_{co})_k = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \dim(Cone_{\Sigma_g}(H_\lambda)_k) = p \cdot 2^{2p}.$$

Therefore, to prove Proposition 1.26, we need to prove there are exactly $(p-1) \cdot 2^{2p}$ -many zero length bars in total for self-mapping cone of egg-beater model. The way to prove this is by running the algorithm, Theorem 3.5 in [UZ15], to get a singular value decomposition so that we can compute barcode in this concrete example. We will demonstrate this by an explicit computational example here.

Remark 8.3. Structure of mapping cone is the key to succeed computing barcode and count its multiplicity. If we work only on $CF_*(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha$, in general, we don't have enough information of Floer boundary operator of $CF_*(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha$ to compute the associated barcode.

8.1. Example of computing barcode. Here we first briefly recall the process of generating a singular value decomposition of linear map $T : (V, \ell_1) \rightarrow (W, \ell_2)$ in a special case that Γ being trivial (here egg-beater model satisfies). For general process, see Theorem 3.5 in [UZ15]. Given an ordered orthogonal basis $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$ for V and $(w_1, \dots, w_m)$ for W , we will run the Gaussian elimination by choosing pivot column where the optimal index pair (i_0, j_0) lies in. Here optimal index pair (i_0, j_0) means

$$(65) \quad \ell_1(v_{j_0}) - \ell_2(w_{i_0}) \leq \ell_1(v_j) - \ell_2(w_i) \quad \text{for all } (i, j) \in \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, m\}.$$

Therefore, after Gaussian elimination, v_j is modified to be $v'_j = v_j - cv_{j_0}$ for some constant $c \in \mathcal{K}$. Moreover, we know

$$\ell(v'_j) = \ell(v_j) \quad \text{and} \quad \ell(Tv'_j) \leq \ell(Tv_j).$$

Note for a filtration preserving map T ,

$$(66) \quad \ell(v'_j) - \ell(Tv'_j) = 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad \ell(v_j) - \ell(Tv_j) = 0.$$

Each step will start from choosing a pivot column and end up with deleting this column from consideration of pivot column for next step. Here is an example relating with our model.⁸

Example 8.4. Let $p = 3$. For $\text{Cone}_{\Sigma_g}(H_\lambda)_{-1} \xrightarrow{(\partial_{co})_{-1}} \text{Cone}_{\Sigma_g}(H_\lambda)_{-2}$, our initial (orthogonal) bases are

$$((b_1, 0), (\phi_\lambda(b_1), 0), (\phi_\lambda^2(b_1), 0), \dots, (b_6, 0), (\phi_\lambda(b_6), 0), (\phi_\lambda^2(b_6), 0))$$

and

$$((0, a), (0, \phi_\lambda(a)), (0, \phi_\lambda^2(a)))$$

for $\text{Cone}_{\Sigma_g}(H_\lambda)_{-1}$ where b_i (for $i = 1, \dots, 6$) and a are fixed points; and

$$((a, 0), (\phi_\lambda(a), 0), (\phi_\lambda^2(a), 0))$$

for $\text{Cone}_{\Sigma_g}(H_\lambda)_{-2}$. First, by action functional formula for each fixed point (see (40) in [PS14]), we can generically get, for $s \in \{0, 1, 2\}$,

$$\ell_{co}((\phi_\lambda^s(b_i), 0)) < \ell_{co}((\phi_\lambda^s(b_j), 0)) \text{ whenever } i < j.$$

Therefore, under the boundary map ∂_{co} , we have,

$$\partial_{co}(\phi_\lambda^s(b_i), 0) = \begin{bmatrix} \partial & -C \circ R_3 + \xi_3 \cdot \mathbb{I} \\ 0 & -\partial \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi_\lambda^s(b_i) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} L(\phi_\lambda^t(a)) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

where $L(\phi_\lambda^t(a))$ is a linear combination of generators $\phi_\lambda^t(a)$ for $t \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Meanwhile,

$$\partial_{co}((0, \phi_\lambda^s(a))) = \begin{bmatrix} -C(\phi_\lambda^{(s+1) \bmod 3}(a)) + \xi_3 \phi_\lambda^s(a) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_\lambda^{(s+1) \bmod 3}(a) + \xi_3 \phi_\lambda^s(a) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

because continuation map C is always in the form

$$C(x) = x + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{strictly lower} \\ \text{filtration term} \end{array} \right\}$$

and by the speciality of generators (with lowest grading), there is no strictly lower filtration terms. In other words, if $(\partial_{co})_{-1}$ is represented by a matrix, it will be a 3 by 21 matrix as

$$(67) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \xi_3 & 0 & -1 & * \dots * \\ -1 & \xi_3 & 0 & * \dots * \\ 0 & -1 & \xi_3 & * \dots * \end{bmatrix}.$$

More importantly, we note

$$\ell_{co}((0, \phi_\lambda^s(a))) - \ell_{co}((\phi_\lambda^t(a), 0)) = \ell(a) - \ell(a) = 0$$

while for any $*$ position in the matrix (67),

$$(68) \quad \ell_{co}(((\phi_\lambda^s(b_i), 0))) - \ell_{co}(0, \phi_\lambda^t(a)) > 0$$

⁸We recommend reader to go through this example carefully before reading the proof of Proposition 1.26 right after it.

therefore, our first choice of pivot column should come from one of the first three columns. Let's take column one. After Gaussian elimination, we have

$$\begin{bmatrix} \xi_3 & 0 & 0 & * \dots * \\ -1 & \xi_3 & -\xi_3^2 & * \dots * \\ 0 & -1 & \xi_3 & * \dots * \end{bmatrix}$$

and $((0, \phi_\lambda^2(a)))$ is changed to $(0, \phi_\lambda^2(a) + \xi_3^2 a)$. Again, by the same reason, our second pivot column can be taken as the second column, so Gaussian elimination will give

$$\begin{bmatrix} \xi_3 & 0 & 0 & * \dots * \\ -1 & \xi_3 & 0 & * \dots * \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & * \dots * \end{bmatrix}$$

and $(0, \phi_\lambda^2(a) + \xi_3^2 a)$ is changed to $(0, \phi_\lambda^2(a) + \xi_3 \phi_\lambda(a) + \xi_3^2 a)$. Note that second factor is in the kernel of $R_3 - \xi_3 \cdot \mathbb{I}$. Thus we get two elements in the singular value decomposition, $(0, a) \rightarrow (-\phi_\lambda(a) + \xi_3 a, 0)$ and $(0, \phi_\lambda(a)) \rightarrow (-\phi_\lambda^2(a) + \xi_3 \phi_\lambda(a), 0)$. Both of them will give zero length bars. The choice of next pivot column will start from column corresponding to generator $(\phi_\lambda^s(b_i), 0)$. But by (68) and (66), we know none of them will give zero length bars. Moreover, by (64), multiplicity of degree- (-2) verbose barcode is 3. So multiplicity of degree- (-2) concise barcode is 1.

8.2. Proof of Proposition 1.26. For any p -tuple generator of $CF_*(\Sigma_g, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha$ denoted as $\{z, \phi(z), \dots, \phi^{p-1}(z)\}$, for the span $V = \text{span}_{\mathcal{X}} \langle z, \phi(z), \dots, \phi^{p-1}(z) \rangle$, the operator $R_p - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}$ on V is represented by the matrix

$$(69) \quad Q_p = \begin{bmatrix} -\xi_p & 0 & \dots & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & -\xi_p & \dots & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -\xi_p & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \dots & -\xi_p \end{bmatrix}$$

and it has rank $p - 1$. Its kernel is

$$\ker(R_p - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I}) = \text{span}_{\mathcal{X}} \langle \xi_p^{p-1} z + \xi_p^{p-2} \phi(z) + \dots + \phi^{p-1}(z) \rangle.$$

Proof. For any degree k , after choosing the standard orthogonal basis of the initial generating loops, boundary map $(\partial_{co})_{k+1}$ can be represented as the following matrix

$$(70) \quad \begin{bmatrix} * & * & \dots & * & * \\ \boxed{P} & * & \dots & * & \vdots \\ 0 & \boxed{P} & \dots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & * & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & \boxed{P} & * \end{bmatrix}$$

where boxed $P = -Q_p$ in (69). Starting from the most left boxed P , we know after choosing pivot columns as describe in the Example 8.4 above, we will have $(p - 1)$ -many elements in the singular value decomposition which contribute to $(p - 1)$ -many

zero length bars. Moreover, after the first $p - 1$ step of Gaussian elimination, we will change the basis element corresponding to the p -th column in (70) in the form

$$v = v_* + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{strictly lower} \\ \text{filtration term} \end{array} \right\}$$

where $v_* \in \ker(R_p - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I})$. Therefore $\ell(v) - \ell((T - \xi_p \cdot \mathbb{I})(v)) > 0$. Meanwhile even though Gaussian elimination will possibly change entries for each column (except pivot columns), due to the nice position of boxed P and the order that we start from the most left boxed P and consecutively move to the last boxed P , we will eventually get

$$\frac{p-1}{p} \dim(CF_k(\Sigma, \phi_\lambda^p)_\alpha) = (p-1) \cdot \binom{2p}{k+p-1}$$

many zero length bars. By (66), we know after we use up all the pairs (under boundary map) from original basis having zero difference on the filtration, others will always give positive length bar. So in total, the multiplicity of zero length bars is

$$\sum_{k=-p+1}^{p+1} (p-1) \cdot \binom{2p}{k+p-1} = (p-1) \cdot 2^{2p}.$$

So we have exactly 2^{2p} -many non-zero positive length bars in total. $\square$

Corollary 8.5. *When $p \geq 3$, $\text{power}_p(\Sigma_g) = \infty$.*

Proof. Proposition 1.26, Lemma 8.2 and Theorem 1.25. $\square$

9. COMPUTATION OF PRODUCT $\Sigma_g \times M$

9.1. Product structure of barcode. Recall that given two filtered chain complexes $(C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C)$ and $(D_*, \partial_D, \ell_D)$ over $\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$, we can form its tensor product

$$((C \otimes D)_*, \partial_\otimes, \ell_\otimes)$$

where

$$(71) \quad \partial_\otimes(a \otimes b) = \partial_C a \otimes b + (-1)^{|a|} a \otimes \partial_D b$$

where $|\cdot|$ denotes degree of element and

$$\ell_\otimes(a \otimes b) = \ell_C(a) + \ell_D(b).$$

Singular value decomposition of $(C \otimes D)_*$ is built from singular value decompositions of C_* and D_* . Specifically, by Proposition 7.4 in [UZ15], each filtered chain complex can be (up to filtered chain isomorphism or filtered homotopy equivalence) decomposed as a direct sum of *elementary filtered complex* (see Definition 7.2 in [UZ15]). In other words, the building blocks are in the form

$$\dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle x \rangle \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots \quad \text{and} \quad \dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle y \rangle \rightarrow \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle \partial y \rangle \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots$$

Therefore, by definition of boundary map (71), we have the following four types elementary complexes for the tensor product structure,

- $\dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle y \otimes z \rangle \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \dots;$
- $\dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle y \otimes z \rangle \rightarrow \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}} \langle \partial y \otimes z \rangle \rightarrow \dots;$

- $\dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{H},\Gamma}} \langle y \otimes z \rangle \rightarrow \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{H},\Gamma}} \langle y \otimes \partial z \rangle \rightarrow \dots;$
- $\dots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{H},\Gamma}} \langle y \otimes z \rangle \rightarrow \text{span}_{\Lambda^{\mathcal{H},\Gamma}} \langle \partial y \otimes z \pm y \otimes \partial z \rangle \rightarrow \dots$

If y and z are elements from singular value decompositions of C_* and D_* , then orthogonality of each of these building blocks are guaranteed by Corollary 8.2 in [Ush13]. Therefore, we have the following proposition describing the barcodes of tensor product.

Proposition 9.1. *Barcode ⁹ of $((C \otimes D)_*, \partial_\otimes, \ell_\otimes)$ is given by carrying on the following operations for the original barcodes from C and D ,*

- For $\partial_C y = \partial_D z = 0$,

$$((\ell_C(y) \bmod \Gamma, \infty), (\ell_D(z) \bmod \Gamma, \infty)) \rightarrow ((\ell_C(y) + \ell_D(z)) \bmod \Gamma, \infty).$$
- For $\partial_C y = x$ and $\partial_D z = 0$,

$$((\ell_C(y) \bmod \Gamma, \ell_C(y) - \ell_C(x)), (\ell_D(z) \bmod \Gamma, \infty)) \rightarrow ((\ell_C(y) + \ell_D(z)) \bmod \Gamma, \ell_C(y) - \ell_C(x)).$$
- For $\partial_C y = 0$ and $\partial_D z = w$,

$$((\ell_C(y) \bmod \Gamma, \infty), (\ell_D(z) \bmod \Gamma, \ell_D(z) - \ell_D(w))) \rightarrow ((\ell_C(y) + \ell_D(z)) \bmod \Gamma, \ell_D(z) - \ell_D(w)).$$
- For $\partial_C y = x$ and $\partial_D z = w$,

$$(\ell_C(x) \bmod \Gamma, \ell_C(y) - \ell_D(x)), (\ell_D(w) \bmod \Gamma, \ell_D(z) - \ell_D(w)) \rightarrow ((\max\{\ell_C(x) + \ell_D(z), \ell_C(y) + \ell_D(w)\}) \bmod \Gamma, \min\{\ell_C(y) - \ell_D(x), \ell_D(z) - \ell_D(w)\}).$$

Proof. All the items are easy to verify. Here, we give the proof of the last item. If $\partial_C y = x$ and $\partial_D z = w$, then under the boundary map,

$$\partial_\otimes(y \otimes z) = \partial_C y \otimes z + (-1)^{|y|} y \otimes \partial_D z = x \otimes z + (-1)^{|y|} y \otimes w$$

since $x \otimes z$ is orthogonal to $y \otimes w$, for filtration, if $\ell_\otimes(x \otimes z) \geq \ell_\otimes(y \otimes w)$ (which is equivalent to $\ell_D(z) - \ell_D(w) \geq \ell_C(y) - \ell_C(x)$), then

$$\ell_\otimes(y \otimes z) - \ell_\otimes(x \otimes z + (-1)^{|y|} y \otimes w) = \ell_C(y) + \ell_D(z) - (\ell_C(x) + \ell_D(z)) = \ell_C(y) - \ell_C(x)$$

and if $\ell_\otimes(x \otimes z) \geq \ell_\otimes(y \otimes w)$ (which is equivalent to $\ell(y) - \ell(x) \geq \ell(z) - \ell(w)$), then

$$\ell_\otimes(y \otimes z) - \ell_\otimes(x \otimes z + (-1)^{|y|} y \otimes w) = \ell_C(y) + \ell_D(z) - (\ell_C(y) + \ell_D(w)) = \ell_D(z) - \ell_D(w).$$

□

Example 9.2. *Suppose we are given two filtered chain complexes,*

$$(C_*, \partial_C, \ell_C) \text{ (with trivial homology)} \quad \text{and} \quad (CF_*(M, \mathbb{I}) = CF_*(M, \mathbb{I})_{pt}, \partial_\mathbb{I}, \ell_\mathbb{I})$$

where M is a symplectically aspherical manifold associated with a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism being identity map. First, in order to have a well-defined Hamiltonian Floer chain

⁹Here degree is not specified.

complex with identity map, we should always think it as the limit of $CF_*(M, \epsilon f)$ for some small $\epsilon > 0$ and a Morse function $f : M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$. Then by standard Floer theory,

$$CF_*(M, \epsilon f) \simeq CM_*(M, \epsilon f)$$

where CM_* represents a Morse chain complex. For barcode of $CM_*(M, \epsilon f)$, there are two types. One is infinite length bars which correspond to the generators of (Morse) homology of M with respect to Morse function ϵf . The other is finite length bars whose lengths are, by Proposition 3.4 in [Ush11], at most $\epsilon \|f\|$ (the total variation of f on M), so they are called “ ϵ -small intervals”.

Now denote

$$\mathcal{B}(C_*) = \{(a, L) \text{ where } L \text{ is finite}\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}(CF_*(M, \epsilon f)) = \{\{\epsilon\text{-small intervals}\}, (c, \infty)\}.$$

For its tensor product $(C \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} CF(M, \epsilon f))_*$, by Proposition 9.1, only the second and fourth items are considered, that is,

$$((a, L), (c, \infty)) \rightarrow (a + c, L)$$

and

$$((a, L), \epsilon\text{-small interval}) \rightarrow \epsilon\text{-small interval}$$

because the output of the operator on a pair of bars as in Proposition 9.1 always takes the minimal of lengths of two bars. Meanwhile, when $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, $CM_*(M, \epsilon f)$ has trivial boundary operator, so, for each degree j ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Betti number } b_j(M) &= \dim H_j(M, \mathcal{K}) \\ &= \dim CM_j(M, \epsilon f) = \dim CF_j(M, \epsilon f) \\ &= \dim HF_j(M, \mathbb{I}) = \{\# \text{ of infinite length bars of degree } j\}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, given $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, for any degree i, j such that $i + j = k$ (where $0 \leq j \leq 2n = \dim(M)$)

$$\mathcal{B}(C_i \otimes_{\mathcal{K}} CF_j(M, \epsilon f)) = \left\{ (a + *, L) \left| \begin{array}{l} (a, L) \in \mathcal{B}(C_i) \\ L \text{ repeats } b_j(M)\text{-many times} \end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

So the multiplicity of (i, j) -piece of degree- k barcode of product is

$$(72) \quad \{\text{multiplicity of } B(C_i)\} \times b_j(M).$$

In general, for any symplectic manifold (M, ω) , not necessarily symplectically aspherical, we count multiplicity of concise barcode in a more subtle way since for $CF_*(M, \mathbb{I})$ (which is isomorphic to regular homology of manifold), Novikov field will be involved because (again since boundary operator is trivial)

$$CF_*(M, \mathbb{I}) \simeq HF_*(M, \mathbb{I}) = H_*(M, \mathcal{K}) \otimes \Lambda^{\mathcal{K}, \Gamma}$$

where $\Gamma \leq \mathbb{R}$. Specifically, adding a homotopy class $S \in \pi_2(M)/(\ker(\omega) \cap \ker(c_1))$ to each critical point p will result in

- (a) filtration is shifted by $\int_{S^2} S^* \omega$;
- (b) CZ-index is shifted by $-2Nc_1(S)$,

where N is minimal Chern number. However, in terms of barcode, shift of filtration (a) will not change the length of bars since the end point is defined modulo Γ . The issue will come from shift of degree because different from the symplectically aspherical case, support of index of $HF_*(M, \mathbb{I})$ might be infinite by the shift of index (b) (when N is nonzero). Quantum Betti number (see Definition 1.28) is then helpful for our counting in the sense that, similar to (72), the number of positive length bars that a (i, j) -piece will contribute is

$$(73) \quad \{\text{multiplicity of } B(C_i)\} \times qb_j(M).$$

Meanwhile, the following lemma is helpful to understand the self-mapping cone of product.

Lemma 9.3. *Considering the following two maps $C \xrightarrow{S} C$ and $D \xrightarrow{\mathbb{I}} D$, then we have a chain isomorphism for any degree m ,*

$$(Cone_{C \otimes D}(S \otimes \mathbb{I}))_m \simeq \bigoplus_k (Cone_C(S))_k \otimes D_{m-k}$$

where the left side is mapping cone of $C \otimes D \xrightarrow{S \otimes \mathbb{I}} C \otimes D$.

Proof. We have the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \bigoplus_k C_k \otimes D_{m-k} & \xrightarrow{S \otimes \mathbb{I}} & \bigoplus_k C_k \otimes D_{m-k} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \bigoplus_k (Cone_C(S))_k \otimes D_{m-k} & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \bigoplus_k C_{k-1} \otimes D_{m-k+1} \\ \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow \phi & & \downarrow h & & \downarrow \phi \\ (C \otimes D)_m & \xrightarrow{S \otimes \mathbb{I}} & (C \otimes D)_m & \xrightarrow{\iota} & Cone_m(S \otimes \mathbb{I}) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & (C \otimes D)_{m-1} \end{array}$$

The top row is a distinguished triangle because tensor (of vector spaces) preserves distinguished triangle here¹⁰ and direct sum of distinguished triangles is also distinguished triangle. Moreover, ϕ is an isomorphism by definition, so there exists a chain map h being an isomorphism. $\square$

9.2. Proof of Proposition 1.27 and 1.29.

Proof. (a) By Proposition 9.1, there will be only the first two types to be considered. Indeed, due to the minimality of the length component in the last two type, it will be neglected eventually because any finite length bar contributed from $CF_*(M, \mathbb{I})_{\{pt\}}$ has ϵ -small length. Moreover, from the operation in Proposition 9.1, especially the second type, the length of finite length bar keeps the same. Therefore, the smallest length of finite length bar of $Cone_{\otimes}(H_\lambda)_*$ is the same as the smallest length of finite length bar of $Cone_{\Sigma_g}(H_\lambda)_*$ coming from egg-beater model. Therefore, we draw the conclusion of Proposition 1.27 by Lemma 8.2.

¹⁰Note that in general, tensoring is only right exact. But here our category only consists of vector spaces, as a special case of flat module, tensoring here is then exact.

(b) Fix the degree of product being 1. By (73) and Proposition 1.26, multiplicity of degree-1 concise barcode of $Cone_{\otimes}(H_{\lambda})_*$ is

$$(74) \quad \sum_{k=-p+1}^{p+1} \binom{2p}{k+p-1} \cdot qb_{1-k}(M).$$

We can split (74) into two parts. One is

$$(75) \quad \binom{2p}{0} \cdot qb_p(M) + \binom{2p}{p} \cdot qb_0(M) + \binom{2p}{2p} \cdot qb_{-p}(M)$$

and

$$(76) \quad \sum_{k \neq \{-p+1, 1, p+1\}} \binom{2p}{k+p-1} \cdot qb_{1-k}(M).$$

Note that each binomial number in (76) is divisible by p , therefore divisibility of (74) depends only on (75). First, it is never equal to zero because $qb_0(M) \neq 0$. Moreover, by Babbage's theorem in [B19], we know

$$\binom{2p}{p} = 2 \binom{2p-1}{p-1} \equiv 2 \pmod{p}.$$

Therefore, modulo p , we get the first conclusion of Proposition 1.29. For its second conclusion, by definition,

$$qb_p(M) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} b_{p+2Ns}(M) \leq \sum_{i \text{ is odd}} b_i(M)$$

because $p + 2Ns$ is always odd. Similarly to $qb_{-p}(M)$; and

$$qb_0(M) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}} b_{2Ns}(M) \leq \sum_{i \text{ is even}} b_i(M)$$

because $2Ns$ is always even. Therefore, together, modulo p , we get (75) is at most $2 \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2n} b_i(M)$. So when $p > \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 2n} b_i(M)$, non-divisibility always holds. $\square$

Remark 9.4. Here we remark that the non-divisibility requirement for Proposition 1.29 can sometimes be improved considerably. Here we give two examples.

- (a) If $c_1(TM) = 0$, then since $qb_k(M) = b_k(M)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, modulo p , (75) is equal to

$$b_p(M) + 2.$$

Therefore, if $p \nmid b_p(M) + 2$, then $p \nmid m_1$.

- (b) If $M = \mathbb{C}P^n$, so $c_1(T\mathbb{C}P^n) = n + 1$ and $b_k(\mathbb{C}P^n)$ is nonzero only when k is even and $k \in [0, 2n]$. Therefore, back to (75), we only need to consider the middle term and modulo p , we get 2. Therefore, the non-divisibility holds for any prime $p \geq 3$ in this case.

REFERENCES

- [AD14] Audin. M, Damian. M, *Morse theory and Floer homology*. Translated from the 2010 French original by Reinie Erne. Universitext. Springer, London; EDP Sciences, Les Ulis, 2014.
- [AKKKPRRSSZ16] Alvarez-Gavela, D., Kaminker, V., Kislev, A., Kliakhandler, K., Pavlichenko, A., Rigolli, L., Rosen, D., Shabtai, O., Stevenson, B., Zhang, J., *Embedding of free groups into asymptotic cones of Hamiltonian diffeomorphisms*. arXiv: 1602.05842v1.
- [B19] C. Babbage, *Demonstration of a theorem relating to prime numbers*, The Edinburgh philosophical journal 1 (1819), 46-49.
- [CZ05] G. Carlsson, A. Zomorodian, *Computing persistent homology*, Discrete Comput. Geom. 33 (2005), no.2, 249-274.
- [FO99] K. Fukaya and K. Ono. *Arnold conjecture and Gromov–Witten invariants*. Topology 38 (1999), 933–1048.
- [Fl89] A. Floer. *Symplectic fixed points and holomorphic spheres*. Comm. Math. Phys. 120 (1989), no. 4, 575–611.
- [GM] Gelfand, S.I., Manni Y.I., *Methods of homological algebra*, Springer, Berlin; New York: ISBN/ISSN 3540547460 (Berlin) 0387547460 (New York).
- [HS95] H. Hofer and D. Salamon. *Floer homology and Novikov rings*. In *The Floer memorial volume*, 483–524, Progr. Math., 133, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1995.
- [Kow13] E. Kowalski, *Representation theory*, <https://people.math.ethz.ch/~kowalske/representation-theory.pdf>
- [MS04] D. McDuff, D. Salamon, *J-holomorphic curves and symplectic topology*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, vol. 52, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004. MR 2045629 (2004m:53154)
- [Pa13] J. Pardon. *An algebraic approach to virtual fundamental cycles on moduli spaces of J-holomorphic curves*. arXiv:1309:2370.
- [PS14] L. Polterovich, E. Shelukhin, *Autonomous Hamiltonian flows, Hofer’s geometry and persistence modules*, Selecta Math. (2015), published online, doi: 10.1007/s00029-015-0201-2.
- [RS93] Robbin, J., Salamon, D., *The Maslov index for paths*, Topology 32, 1993, 827-844.
- [Sal90] Salamon, D., *Morse theory, the Conley index and Floer homology*, Bull. L.M.S. 22 113-140, (1990)
- [Sal97] Salamon.D., *Lectures on Floer homology*. In Symplectic geometry and topology (Park City, Utah, 1997). AMS, Providence, 1999. MR1702944.
- [Ush08] Usher, M., *Spectral numbers in Floer theories*. Compositio Math. 144 (2008), 1581-1592.
- [Ush11] Usher, M., *Boundary depth in Floer theory and its applications to Hamiltonian dynamics and coisotropic submanifolds*, Israel Journal of Mathematics, 184 (2011), 1-57.
- [Ush13] Usher, M., *Hofer metric and boundary depth*, Annales scientifiques de l’ENS 46, fascicule 1 (2013), 57-128
- [UZ15] M. Usher, J. Zhang, *Persistent homology and Floer-Novikov theory*, To appear in Geometry & Topology.

E-mail address: jzhang@math.uga.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA 30602